

OBSERVATIONS  
ON THE  
*ROMAN CATHOLIC*  
QUESTION.

---

BY THE  
RIGHT HON. LORD KENYON.

---

*FOURTH EDITION, WITH ADDITIONS.*

---

LONDON:  
Printed for J. J. STOCKDALE, No. 41, Pall-Mall.

---

1812.

*Price 4s.*

THE HISTORY OF

THE

WILSONIAN VILLAGE

OF THE

WILSONIAN VILLAGE

OF THE

WILSONIAN VILLAGE

OF THE

WILSONIAN VILLAGE

Printed by Cox and Baylis, Great Queen Street,  
Lincoln's-Inn-Fields.

## ERRATA.

| Page | Line      |   |
|------|-----------|---|
| 3    | 5         | after <i>petition</i> add <i>to</i> .                 |
| 7    | 1         | for <i>true</i> read <i>truer</i> .                   |
| 10   | 7         | for <i>or</i> read <i>nor</i> .                       |
| 13   | 16        | after <i>IId.</i> add <i>and</i> .                    |
| 14   | Note,     | after <i>see</i> add <i>Mr. Pitt's Speech</i> .       |
| 17   | '7        | after <i>said</i> add <i>require him</i> .            |
| 23   | 12        | for <i>clamourously</i> read <i>clamorous</i> .       |
| 25   | 5         | after <i>was</i> add <i>stated to be</i> .            |
| 41   | 9 and 12, | for <i>alterum</i> read <i>altum</i> .                |
| 46   | 13        | for <i>subjects</i> read <i>subject</i> .             |
| 47   | 6         | for <i>supposing</i> read <i>suppose</i> .            |
| —    | 7         | after <i>contrary</i> add <i>he</i> .                 |
| 48   | 8         | dele <i>that</i> .                                    |
| 50   | 4         | from the bottom, for <i>with</i> read <i>but in</i> . |
| 61   | 6         | —— ———, after <i>object</i> add a <i>commu</i> .      |

CHURCH OF ST. MARY

1840

CHURCH OF ST. MARY

CHURCH OF ST. MARY

CHURCH OF ST. MARY

CHURCH OF ST. MARY

CHURCH OF ST. MARY

CHURCH OF ST. MARY

CHURCH OF ST. MARY

CHURCH OF ST. MARY

CHURCH OF ST. MARY

CHURCH OF ST. MARY

Printed by Cox and Baylis, Great Queen Street,  
Lincoln's-Inn-Fields.



## ERRATA.

| Page | Line      |   |
|------|-----------|---|
| 3    | 5         | after <i>petition</i> add <i>to</i> .                 |
| 7    | 1         | for <i>true</i> read <i>truer</i> .                   |
| 10   | 7         | for <i>or</i> read <i>nor</i> .                       |
| 13   | 16        | after <i>IId.</i> add <i>and</i> .                    |
| 14   | Note,     | after <i>see</i> add <i>Mr. Pitt's Speech</i> .       |
| 17   | 7         | after <i>said</i> add <i>require him</i> .            |
| 23   | 12        | for <i>clamourously</i> read <i>clamorous</i> .       |
| 25   | 5         | after <i>was</i> add <i>stated to be</i> .            |
| 41   | 9 and 12, | for <i>alterum</i> read <i>altum</i> .                |
| 46   | 13        | for <i>subjects</i> read <i>subject</i> .             |
| 47   | 6         | for <i>supposing</i> read <i>suppose</i> .            |
| —    | 7         | after <i>contrary</i> add <i>he</i> .                 |
| 48   | 8         | dele <i>that</i> .                                    |
| 50   | 4         | from the bottom, for <i>with</i> read <i>but in</i> . |
| 61   | 6         | —— ———, after <i>object</i> add a <i>comma</i> .      |

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

# OBSERVATIONS,

&c. &c.

---

THE motives which have induced me to offer the following pages to the public proceed from an anxiety not to permit the opportunity now given, for considering the Roman Catholic Petition, pass without recording my sentiments on the subject; and, being aware of the superior claims to attention, from their ability and consequence, of many, who will probably discuss the measure in parliament, I have adopted this mode of canvassing the question, which I propose to consider, with reference

First, to the Nature of a Church-Establishment.

Secondly, to the true Character of Toleration.

Thirdly, to different Acts of Parliament, and the Coronation-oath.

Fourthly, to the Character of the Roman Catholic Religion itself, and how far it may have undergone any alteration.

Fifthly, to the grounds alleged in favour of farther Concessions to the Roman Catholics.

Sixthly, to any probable good effect to be expected, on the whole, from such Concessions.

First, as to the nature of a church-establishment, and the means of its preservation.

A church-establishment is intended for the benefit of the state, by preserving, and providing for the public exercise of, what is considered as the most sound religion. Its importance, in a social point of view, arises from the necessity that a sense of religion should be impressed on the minds and con-



sciences of the people; to say nothing of the high advantage resulting from the general acknowledgement of a consistent rule of conduct, springing from motives the most pure and efficacious.

Such being the importance, and indeed the necessity, of an established religion, the question naturally presents itself, how is a religion to be securely established? Do privileges conferred on its clergy, and stipends for the performance of their sacred duty, afford it security? If indeed it could be certain that those in authority would be always conscientiously and zealously attached to its cause, nothing more would be necessary; but, as it would be absurd to expect such attachment from those who are not in its communion, there exists an obvious danger, that persons of this description would employ their power and influence against the establishment. The only effectual way, therefore, of affording security to an established church is, to restrict to its members the possession of that power, which, if placed in other hands, would en-

danger it. Therefore it is required, in this country, that not only the sovereign, but all persons appointed to offices of power and trust in the state, should be of the established religion. This is the true object of the Test-laws, which require, on the part of such persons, an actual communion with the national church, by taking the sacrament of the Lord's supper according to its rites. This ceremony, however, it should be remembered, is required, not as itself constituting a qualification for office, as some persons have erroneously conceived, but as furnishing a proof, or test, that the persons so celebrating that holy ordinance are members of the establishment, on the presumption that none but its members would communicate with it. It follows, from what has been said, that laws, establishing a test of some kind to ascertain the fact that persons appointed to office are members of the established church, are essential to the security of an ecclesiastical establishment. But to make that security complete, it is plain, that those laws must themselves be



secure; and it should seem that no true notion can be formed with regard to such security than that, in respect of making and altering laws, the establishment should have as much weight as is necessary for its maintenance. In a word, what is here insisted on is this, that a church is *not to be considered as established* merely from the circumstance of stipends being given to its clergy, but from authority, influence, and laws, guarding its ascendancy.

We are now to consider the true character of toleration. Toleration means no more than a permission to every individual to adhere to that faith and form of worship which are most agreeable to the dictates of his conscience.

Toleration is opposed to persecution; and, as the former consists in an unrestrained liberty of conscience and of worship, the latter cannot be said to exist, unless, by means affecting either the person or the property of an individual, some restraint be imposed upon that liberty. Where there is no such restraint, perfect toleration may be

said to exist. There can therefore be no question as to the full enjoyment of toleration, as well by the Romanists as by every other class of Dissenters in the British islands. The question then with regard to restraints or disabilities is, whether too many exist, and whether good is not on the whole the result. That question must depend on the necessity of the restraints towards securing what is more advantageous to the community than the restraints are disadvantageous to those affected by them, which brings back the subject to what is essential to the security of a church-establishment. If the restraints go farther than to secure it from probable hazard, they extend too far; but can any one doubt, if the enemies of an establishment seek to be admitted to the power of altering those laws which are its security (indeed almost the establishment itself), whether those who would preserve the existing order of things are bound to resist the demand?

It cannot be meant, that stipends to

ministers of religion, paid by the public, are necessary to toleration; because that does not exist in the case of any of the dissenters from the church, nor in that of the episcopal communion in Scotland; and the guarded care which was taken, on a late application in this country on behalf of the clergy of that communion, not to disgust the established church in Scotland, by affording any other than private assistance to the tolerated church, is a strong argument for my present position. The matter of policy, with respect to any such allowance of stipends, is a very different question. In the case of the Dissenters in Ireland it has been allowed, and no doubt because they were deemed friendly to the union with England, and to the constitution in church and state; the allowance also for the education at home of the Irish Romanists results from policy merely; but these and any other accidental cases which may be cited are only deviations from the broad rule and principle, for peculiar reasons not affecting its



general application ; toleration may be considered as a right, *generally speaking* ; but, supposing any religion should contain doctrines, which, if reduced to practice, would be hostile to the state and the interests of society, it can not be doubted that to such a religion toleration would not or ought to be extended. The tolerant disposition, however, of the church of England is warmly proclaimed by even its enemies ;\* and it is worthy serious consi-

\* See “ A sermon preached on the 4th of November, 1788, before the society for commemorating the glorious revolution, by Andrew Kippis, D. D. &c.”

“ It is permitted us to think, to judge, to act, for ourselves ; it is permitted us to search the sacred records with freedom, and to follow the instructions we derive from them ; and every other advantage is enjoyed by us in the way to supreme felicity.” Page 36.

“ When every deduction is made, I ask, in what period we should rather have chosen to live than in that which hath succeeded the revolution ? In what period could we have enjoyed superior advantages of a personal, domestic, social, literary, philosophical, and religious, nature ? The times of Alfred and the Saxon monarchs were times of darkness and confusion. In the victorious days of Edward III. and Henry V.

deration, whether any sound advocate for true toleration would endanger that im-

“ ignorance and popery prevailed ; the land was uncivilized ; and the common people were little better than slaves to the barons. Queen Elizabeth was, undoubtedly, one of the greatest princesses that ever existed. She governed the realm with wisdom and courage, protected the Protestant interest abroad, raised the honour and credit of the nation, advanced trade, and caused the kingdom to flourish. But yet these were only the beginnings of improvement. At the same time, she was often arbitrary in the management of affairs, and her treatment of parliaments. There were dangerous factions at home ; persecutions for conscience sake were not laid aside ; and the followers of Essex were prosecuted with a rigour, which, to a milder age, appears to be unaccountable. Learning, indeed, was cultivated, but the noblest subjects of knowledge, religion and liberty, were, comparatively, but little understood. On the whole, then, we shall with pleasure adhere to the testimony of Mr. Hume, who, in speaking of the æra which has been subsequent to the revolution, hath made use of the following language. ‘ So long and so glorious a period no nation almost can boast of ; nor is there another instance in the whole history of mankind, that so many millions of people have, during such a space of time, been held together in a manner so free, so rational, and so suitable to the dignity of human nature.’ ”

portant object, by lessening the security of a church, which so essentially cherishes that spirit and principle; and, if candidly considered, it would surely appear, that, when the civil and religious liberty which is now enjoyed throughout this empire is adverted to, and, what alone can give any hopes of either being perpetuated, that religion is a vital principle of the constitution and the laws, he must be hardy indeed who would risk the blessings which are enjoyed for an amendment which at best is problematical.

THE NEXT POINT FOR CONSIDERATION IS, WHAT DIFFERENT ACTS OF PARLIAMENT HAVE DECLARED ON THIS SUBJECT, AND THE NATURE OF THE CORONATION-OATH. The different acts of parliament alluded to are the 13th, 25th, and 30th, Cha. II. the acts of uniformity of Eliz. and Chas. II. the 1st of W. and M. and 5th Anne, c. 8.

The 13th of Charles II. requires the sacrament to be taken before admission to offices; the 25th excludes Dissenters from



corporations; the 30th excludes Romanists from parliament and offices of trust; and the 5th of Queen Anne, being on the union of England and Scotland, establishes the respective churches in each as fundamental points of the union, and declares the laws, then in force for the preservation of the church, to be immutable; to the principles therefore deducible from these laws, and applicable to the character of the coronation-oath, it may be well to attend.

These laws, excepting that of Elizabeth concerning uniformity, were all in contemplation of what had happened in the great rebellion; or of the probable effects of the accession of James the II<sup>d</sup>. of what had occurred in his reign. As far as the policy and necessity of these laws arose from the claimant to the throne being a Roman Catholic, they do not now apply: but it is not unworthy consideration, whether, although there is now no popish claimant to the throne, the principles which made such claimant dangerous are not dangerous in themselves. If the attachment to

a popish claimant was on account of his religion, (and it would be absurd to doubt it, nor is it any reflection on the Romanists to believe it, for if sincere Roman Catholics they must feel such attachment,\*) it cannot be doubted, that they, who profess these principles, would desire, by lawful means, to obtain for themselves such advantages as they hoped for through him; and how should they obtain it? The laws of the land have required the King to be of the Established Church; but, supposing all other privileges were extended to the Romanists, it surely cannot enter into the mind of man to doubt, that they would seek this last important one, that the King should be a Roman Catholic! And, be it remembered, that it is in parliament only that the trial would be made. Who can doubt, then, of the extreme hazard to which the laws would be put in such a case! Who can doubt the differ-

\* "I do not mean to shut my eyes to this conviction, that a Catholic, however honourable his intentions may be, must feel anxious to advance the interests of his religion."—See Cobbett's Parl. Deb. 1805, pages 1015-16.

ence between a king papistically inclined, with a parliament including many Roman Catholics, and a protestant parliament and protestant counsellors. The principles which the different acts of parliament and settlement at the revolution have established are these: viz. that the union of government, ecclesiastical and civil, is essential to the peace and happiness of England; that to secure such object the king must be protestant, and in communion with the church of England; and that any means leading, in probability, to the creation of a power disposed to shake the security of the church-establishment must be resisted. Such were the solid principles established at the revolution, and recognized by the act of Queen Anne, on the union with Scotland; and whatever relaxations have taken place since, have always been admitted with a view to such principles, whether it can be justly maintained or not, that they always have sufficiently kept within them. The present most conciliatory relaxation of the principle, by the an-



nual act of indemnity, shews the necessity of preserving the letter of the law : and the anxious wish which prevails to preserve it in as light and mild a degree as possible, and not to exert it to its extent without a compulsive necessity, should completely reconcile us to the existing system, known as it is to be beneficial by long practice, and should operate strongly against the admission of untried theories, holding forth, indeed, more extensive good, but fraught, for any thing their abettors can prove by the same solid test of experiment, with practical mischief.

- It must be remembered how extremely important it is to maintain these principles; how essential to the perpetuity of our constitution. The alteration in the coronation-oath at the time of the union with Scotland; the principles established at the revolution; and the declaration in the act of union, that the laws then existing for the preservation of the church were fundamental and unalterable should not be forgotten ; nor that it is on the ground of being the protectors of a government essentially

protestant, and on those alone, that the House of Brunswick possess the Crown of this united kingdom. And it is indeed to be wondered at, that any one professing himself attached to that succession can wish to alter laws which his duty as well as interest, it may most justly be said, to uphold. If the day of trial should ever arrive, and the motives influencing those who profess popery are called into action either by a domestic or foreign cause,—the safety of the throne and constitution will depend intirely on the strong ascendancy of the protestant subjects. If the principle of protestant union in church and state were abandoned, which I insist the granting of power, legislative or military, to the Romanists would essentially destroy, it is impossible to see on what it is that any title to the throne would remain to the family of the House of Brunswick. Let those who doubt on the admissibility of the Romanists to power seriously consider this.

A consideration, and a most important one, arises as to the nature and extent of

the settlement at the revolution; in which the points of general toleration, as connected with a church-establishment, and the constitution of the government generally, were most fully contemplated: and a more important question can hardly be brought forward, than whether the principles of establishment and toleration, as then fixed on the settlement of the crown, can retain their character, as principles of the constitution, if the arguments advanced for the Roman Catholic claims be admitted. It should be recollected, that Roman Catholics were, at that time, excluded from parliament, by the 30th of Charles II. and that all the apprehensions then entertained, which arose from passing, or just passed, events, were on account of a supposed attachment to Popery on the part of the sovereign. At such a time, the feelings of parliament and the nation being so strong against the Roman Catholics, it will scarcely be argued, that any reservation, with a view to allow future favours towards them, was intended. It cannot, therefore, be a stretch of as-



sumption to contend, that, as the guards which were imposed applied to the king alone, such guards, accompanied by the consideration of the principles on which they were stated to be applied, must leave it to be concluded, that the non-admission of Roman Catholics in parliament was deemed to have been secured : and it should not be forgotten, that, in these times, the apprehensions which were entertained of Popery WERE RAISED BY ITS ACTUAL PRINCIPLES. The great men who lived in that dark age, as it is now wished to be considered, thought that principles tended to produce correspondent actions; and it was because by the actions of papists that the danger of their principles was established, that the necessary guards were provided. It is a device of the advocates for the Roman Catholics to state, that religion was not the great object at the revolution; though every thing shows that the establishment of the Protestant religion was so; and, though all the dangers to the liberties of the country, in truth, sprang from attempts made to violate the

laws, in different instances, for the sake of promoting Popery. The declaration of indulgence of James II. it is most curious to observe, brings forward all the motives and arguments on which the concessions to the Roman Catholics are now urged : \* liberty of

\* Extracts from his two Declarations :

“ We humbly thank Almighty God, it is, and hath  
“ of long time been, our constant sense and opinion,  
“ (which, upon divers occasions, we have declared,) that  
“ conscience ought not to be constrained, nor people  
“ forced, in matters of mere religion. It hath ever been  
“ directly contrary to our inclinations, as we think it is  
“ to the interest of government, which it obeys, by spoil-  
“ ing trade, depopulating countries, and discouraging  
“ strangers,—and, finally, that it never obtained the end  
“ for which it was employed.”

“ In the first place, we do declare, that we will protect  
“ and maintain our archbishops, bishops, and clergy,—  
“ and all other our subjects of the church of England, in  
“ the free exercise of their religion, as by law established,  
“ and in the quiet and full enjoyment of all their posses-  
“ sions, without any molestation or disturbance whatso-  
“ ever.”

“ Forasmuch as we are desirous to have the benefit of  
“ the service of all our loving subjects, which, by the  
“ law of nature, is inseparably annexed to, and inherent  
“ in, our royal person; and that none of our subjects

conscience, the great advantages to trade, the benefit to the state from the admissibi-

“ may, for the future, be under any discouragement or  
 “ disability, (who are otherwise well inclined and fit to  
 “ serve us,) by reason of some oaths or tests, that have  
 “ been usually administered on such occasions, we do  
 “ hereby farther declare, that it is our royal will and  
 “ pleasure, that the oaths, commonly called the oaths of  
 “ supremacy and allegiance, and also the several tests  
 “ and declarations mentioned in the acts of parliament,  
 “ made in the 25th and 30th years of the reign of our late  
 “ royal brother, King Charles the Second, shall not, at  
 “ any time hereafter, be required to be taken, declared,  
 “ or subscribed, by any person or persons whatsoever,  
 “ who is or shall be employed in any office or place of  
 “ trust, either civil or military, under us, or in our go-  
 “ vernment.”

“ We have resolved to use our uttermost endeavours  
 “ to establish liberty of conscience on such just and  
 “ equal foundations as will render it unalterable, and  
 “ secure to all people the free exercise of their religion  
 “ for ever, by which future ages may reap the benefit of  
 “ what is so undoubtedly for the general good of the  
 “ whole kingdom. It is such a security we desire, with-  
 “ out the burden and constraint of oaths and tests, which  
 “ have been unhappily made by some governments, but  
 “ could never support any; nor should men be advanced,  
 “ by such means, to offices and employments, which  
 “ ought to be the reward of services, fidelity, and merit.



lity of all persons to stations of trust, the removal of all discontents by not letting re-

“ In pursuance of this great work, we have been forced  
“ to make many changes both of civil and military offices  
“ throughout our dominions, not thinking any ought to  
“ be employed in our service who will not contribute  
“ towards the establishing the peace and greatness of  
“ their country, which we most earnestly desire, as un-  
“ biassed men may see, by the whole conduct of our go-  
“ vernment, by the condition of our fleets and of our  
“ armies, which, with good management, shall be con-  
“ stantly the same, and greater, if the safety or honour  
“ of the nation require it. We recommend these con-  
“ siderations to all our subjects, and that they will reflect  
“ on their present ease and happiness, how, for above  
“ three years, that it hath pleased God to permit us to  
“ reign over these kingdoms, we have not appeared to  
“ be that prince our enemies would have made the world  
“ afraid of; our chief aim having been not to be the op-  
“ pressor but the father of our people, of which we can  
“ give no better evidence than by conjuring them to lay  
“ aside all private animosities as well as groundless  
“ jealousies.”—See Rapin, vol. II. p. 762. And Trial of  
the seven Bishops.”

Let it not be forgotten, that this declaration was made only one year before James's abdication of his throne, and was the ground-work of his subjects withdrawing their allegiance from him. With what sincerity this was done by this infatuated monarch himself may be determined

religious differences be any obstacle to their preferment in any way, are among the strongest motives offered in its favour :\* but the nation then happily saw, that, however insinuating and plausible, such sounds and words might be only delusions : it then felt the value of religious principles, and considered, that a religious establishment alone, fenced by due safeguards, could preserve the liberties of England ; nay, even the liberties of those very persons who were clamourously against it. It is observable, too, that exclusion from power was connected

by what is known of his general relentless temper, and the severe persecutions he exercised towards the Roman Catholics of Ireland, both previous and subsequent to this declaration. And surely we may be allowed to hesitate, at least, concerning the degree of confidence to be reposed in similar professions in our own days, from whatever quarter they may originate, either, the Roman Catholics themselves or their advocates.

\* To show the coincidence between the acts of the Romanists and practices of infidels and anarchists, it is curious to refer to the Extracts from French "Rights of Man."

with the toleration-act ; and that the declaration of King William, when prince of Orange, to King James,† through Fagel, the minister

† “ Their highnesses cannot agree to the repeal of the  
“ tests, or of those other penal laws that tend to the se-  
“ curity of the Protestant religion, since the Roman  
“ Catholics receive no other prejudices from these than  
“ the being excluded from parliaments, or from public  
“ employments, and that by them the Protestant reli-  
“ gion is covered from all the designs of the Roman Ca-  
“ tholics against it, or against the public safety ; and  
“ neither the test nor those other laws can be said to  
“ carry in them any severity against the Roman Catho-  
“ lics upon account of their consciences ; they are only  
“ provisions, qualifying them to be members of parlia-  
“ ment, or to be capable of bearing office, by which  
“ they must declare, before God and men, that they were  
“ for the Protestant religion : so that, indeed, all this  
“ amounts to no more than a securing the Protestant re-  
“ ligion from any prejudices that it may receive from the  
“ Roman Catholics,

“ Their highnesses have thought, and do still think,  
“ that more than this ought not to be asked or expected  
“ from them, since, by this means, the Roman Catho-  
“ lics and their posterity will be for ever secured  
“ from all trouble in their persons or estates, or in the  
“ exercise of their religion ; and, that the Roman Catho-  
“ lics ought to be satisfied with this, and not to disquiet



at the Hague, stated the necessity, on principle, of guarding an established church by the security of tests; that without it the establishment could not be considered secure; and the practice was universal.

Such being the true character of the principles which guided the revolution in 1688, and according to which the subsequent acts, above referred to, were framed, it is to be considered what effect, in point of principle, would be produced, by allowing the argu-

“ the kingdom, because they cannot be admitted to sit  
 “ in parliament, or to be in employments, or because  
 “ those laws, in which the security of the Protestant re-  
 “ ligion does chiefly consist, are not repealed, by which  
 “ they must be put in a condition to overturn it.

“ Their highnesses do also believe, that the dissenters  
 “ will be fully satisfied, when they shall be for ever  
 “ covered from all danger of being disturbed or punished  
 “ for the free exercise of their religion, upon any sort of  
 “ pretence whatsoever.”

See—“ A letter writ by Myn Heer Fagel, pensionary of Holland, to Mr. James Aewart, advocate, giving an account of the prince and princess of Orange’s thoughts concerning the repeal of the test and penal laws.”—Life of King James II.—London,—1705.

ments to prevail by which the Roman Catholic claims are supported.

It would at once be allowing, that all officers under the crown and members of parliament, may be of the very religion which, at the revolution, none could be ; it would enable the king, if papistically inclined, instantly, with lawful means, to change the coronation-oath and the laws ; and himself become a convert to the Roman Catholic religion ; and to do this by the supreme power of the state. Would it then be said, that the church of England had an establishment ? Supposing the provision for the clergy to continue unimpaired, yet the government could no longer be called Protestant, nor would the union of church and state, and succession in the protestant line, those grand and characteristic principles of the revolution, any longer exist ; at that period were not these principles considered in want of the safeguards which were then afforded them ? And can it be conceived, that the principal characters who acted in that grand crisis would

have thought the admission of popish advisers and popish legislators consistent with the security of the protestant ascendancy? Did they not charge James II. with being *misled by popish advisers*? Modern reformers think, or profess to think, that, if the king himself is of the established church, all is safe; and this, though they are most forward to establish, that in every act the king should be guided by the advice of his counsellors. What but infatuation or the bias of party can induce any man to favour such doctrines?

How completely are they in opposition to all the principles of the revolution, and of the Act of Settlement, whereby the crown was limited to the illustrious House of Brunswick? And is it now, when, for above a century we have experienced in increased riches, prosperity, and freedom, civil and religious, (the blessings derived from and possessed under that settlement,) that every thing is to be risked on a mere speculation of public benefit? The avowed object is to conciliate the Roman Catholics,



but it is to be feared that their antipathy to the protestant ascendancy is radical; and should the folly of the grant be at last discovered, civil contention alone could recall those principles, when once abandoned, which our postèrity would find, as our ancestors did, essential to the preservation of the present establishments. Toleration of the most perfect kind is now enjoyed; it has even been increased, with respect to the Roman Catholics, to an immense degree, not only beyond all pretensions of right, but it is to be feared, in Ireland, beyond what a due attention to the defence of the church would have sanctioned. Now, at length, it is surely wise to become cautious, and, though good faith requires that all privileges which were granted on the union with Ireland be maintained, let us profit by the warnings given by history, attend to the principles established in our laws, and, regarding the actual state of comfort which every British subject enjoys, remember, "that to innovate is not to reform."



On this subject, too, it is not right to omit entirely the hardships to which the sovereign is reduced; if all others in the kingdom may enjoy perfect freedom in the choice of their religion, shall he alone be restrained? In a government like our's, it is true that certain restraints on the sovereign are necessary, but then they are always with a view to something important; that he cannot act without advice; that he cannot use his prerogatives but in certain modes, and to a certain extent; that the graces, and bounties, and even mercies, of the crown are limited and restrained is notorious; but this is so because the public good requires it: now, if it is contended that Roman Catholic principles, if professed by all the highest authorities in the state, except the sovereign, are neither dangerous nor inconsistent with fundamental principles, it is difficult to conceive for whose benefit, or with what view, this restriction is to be continued towards the sovereign alone, and even so far as to make the crown forfeited, if not complied with.

With respect to the coronation-oath, its construction must be gathered from the words of the oath itself, from the historical circumstances relating to it, and the laws connected with it, with due regard to the conscientious feelings of the sovereign taking it. That the king is bound to secure to the bishops and clergy their peculiar rights, and to the church its doctrines, are points indisputable; now, if from the mere wording of the oath it seems to include, in the sovereign's judgement, other political matters connected therewith, as essential to the security of these, which are specially provided for, it surely must be his duty to act upon that construction, however comprehensive, which his own mind thinks the most correct and proper. A matter of conscience ought not to be lowered down to the literal terms in which the undertaking is expressed; the fair meaning should be the rule; and it would ill become any one to resort to the niceties of legal expression, as excuses for breaking the *spirit* of an engagement registered in

heaven. It surely will not be seriously contended that the conscience of the sovereign is not to be regarded. That would introduce a dilemma unanswerable by the promoters of the claims of the Romanists; for, if the sovereign were to have Roman Catholic advisers and a Roman Catholic parliament, on what but his own conscience would any maintenance of the established church have to rest? By reference to the debates, at the time when the form of the oath was prescribed, it appears to have been stated (especially by Mr. Godolphin) that the security must be in the king's conscience: it is left for the plausible reasoners of the present enlightened times to explain away every thing which our guides and preservers deemed important at the revolution; and to justify the acceptance of such advice as deprived King James II. of his throne. But the principle of the coronation-oath is to be collected, not only from the words, but also from the laws existing when it was prescribed, and the spirit and

character of these laws. By these, as collected from history, it will appear, that the oath was added as a farther security against the admission of Roman Catholics into parliament, corporations, or places of trust. Nor is even this all;\* for, at the union with Scotland, all these very laws were incorporated in the act, and declared to be for the preservation of the church.

It is, therefore, not enough that the church might perhaps remain without them, as they were enacted to afford it *additional security*. On the whole it appears very evident, that a conscientious adherence to an oath, originally required of the sovereign as a farther security that the English constitution might ever remain essentially protestant in church and state, requires an absolute denial on his part to any farther demands which may be made for concessions to the Roman Catholics. If the parliament will not do its duty, it is for the sovereign to remember,

\* See the 5 Anne, chap. 8, "For the union of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland."



be it asserted with deference and humility, that he is still not absolved from his engagement; but is bound, by every tie, to his family, his country, and his God, to maintain, in spirit and in truth, an engagement by which he holds his throne. And may the general sentiment of the country be ever asserted, in the maintenance of our happy constitution, as, blessed be God, it has been by our present venerable and beloved monarch.

We must now direct our attention to the nature itself of the Roman Catholic church; and here an important consideration will arise as to the alteration which its doctrines and tenets may have undergone. The nature of the Roman Catholic church is to be collected from the decrees of its councils, and from the articles of its faith; among the most important of which, as relating to the present subject, are to be enumerated:

1. The belief in the supreme authority of the see of Rome.
2. The doctrine of absolution.

3. The refusal on the part of its members to keep faith with heretics.

Respecting the first of these articles, the peculiar engagements required both of the priests and laity clearly demonstrate that the grand object of the Roman Catholic church is to establish the connection between the spiritual influence of the holy see and its temporal power and dominion. The oath taken by every Roman Catholic bishop is a convincing proof of this assertion.

“I, N. from this time forward, will be *faithful* and obedient to my lord the pope and his successors. The counsels with which they trust me I will not disclose to *any man*, to the hurt of the pope or his successors. I will assist them to retain the popedom and the royalties of St. Peter against *all men*. I will carefully *preserve, defend, and promote, the rights, honours, privileges, and authority, of the Pope*. I will not be in any counsel, deed, or treaty, in which any thing prejudicial to the person, *rights, or power, of the pope* is contrived;

and if I shall know any such things treated of by *any whomsoever*, I will (to the utmost of my power) hinder them, and with all possible speed signify them to the pope. I will, to the utmost of my power, observe the pope's *commands*, and make others observe them. I will impugn and persecute heretics and rebels to my lord the pope, &c.” A saving clause of fidelity to the sovereign, has been since omitted.

An obligation more firm than this is not easily to be imagined; the extent of which cannot be ascertained by the fair reasoning of a common Protestant unacquainted with the history of the Roman Catholic church and the nature of its doctrines; it can be determined alone by an intimate knowledge of the frame, construction, and designs, of that church, and of the various and important events which have taken their rise from these circumstances, not only in ages more remote, but during the course of later years.

We shall therefore materially elucidate this part of the subject by a reference to



some of the standard canons and authorities of the church of Rome, and by a comparison of these with the doctrines received, acknowledged, and acted upon, in modern times; from whence it will indisputably be proved, that no assertion was ever more correct, than that of a zealous member of the Roman Catholic church, Mr. Plowden, in a publication entitled "The Case Stated," (page 17). "If any one says, or pretends to insinuate, that the modern Roman Catholics, who are the objects of the late bounty of parliament, differ in one iota from their predecessors, he is either deceived himself, or he wishes to deceive others. *Semper eadem* is not less emphatically descriptive of our religion than of our jurisprudence."

Let us first examine the celebrated bull, repeated yearly at Rome, on the Thursday in Passion Week, in which we shall find the following passage: "We excommunicate and curse all Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, Hugonots, and heretics; and whosoever shall receive, defend;



or favour, them.” Surely from this passage arises the irreconcilable difficulty of being at once a good Papist and a good subject to a Protestant sovereign. Again, it is stated, in the great council of Lateran, in the time of Innocent III. and inserted in the body of canons by Gregory IX. “That some seculars have attempted to usurp too far upon the sacred rights, when they have required ecclesiastics, who have nothing temporal in their character, to take an oath of fidelity. We therefore prohibit, by the authority of a sacred council, all such priests from taking oaths to secular authorities in such manner.” It is added also by Innocent III. “That, in case of an oath being taken, as a security against conspiracy, they were not so bound by that oath but that they might stand against the prince (to whom they had so sworn) in the lawful defence of the rights and honours of the church and their own.” And again, in the great Lateran council, as the Romanists call it, in 1215, it is declared, “That the pope may depose kings, absolve their subjects

from their oaths of allegiance, and give away their kingdoms." This great council is confessed, by Dr. Troy, the titular bishop of Dublin, to carry all the weight of a council; in the same council (which is also confirmed by the council of Trent) it is declared, "All are excommunicated, of what degree soever, whether regal, imperial, &c. who impose any tax on ecclesiastics without express license from the pope," (even though they may be willing to pay it,) and this immunity is declared to be "established by the ordinance of God and the sanctions of the canons." It is also stated, in the bull of Sixtus V. 1585, "That the authority given to St. Peter and his successors, by the immense power of the Eternal King, excels all power of earthly kings: it passes uncontroulable sentence upon them all." These then are the old and established doctrines of the church of Rome, promulgated by the authority of general councils, and of the infallible church, and necessarily received as genuine, and consi-

dered as obligatory by every Roman Catholic.

Have the Romanists in Great Britain, in one single instance, produced an authenticated repeal and disavowal of such tenets which has been authorized by the pope, by the church, by general councils, or by their own unanimous vote and recantation.

“ Once for all, be it permitted here to consider how partial and inadequate any other appeal than that to the articles and canons of the church of Rome must be, as to the questions agitated concerning the doctrines maintained by the Roman Catholics. What the doctrines of any church, as such, are, can be known, *so as to be relied upon*, only by its articles and canons. They are the code of its legislation; and though, as in every other code, there may be points which may be suffered to lie dormant, interpreted occasionally with lenity, or wished abrogated by individuals, still, whilst the letter of the statute subsists unaltered, it is in force, and nothing but the formal repeal,



by the competent power, annuls it."—Roberts's Review, page 46.

It shall, however, be attempted satisfactorily to shew, from modern authorities and modern practice, that as firm an adherence to all these tenets exists among the present Romanists as in the most bigoted times of antiquity. To establish which let Mr. C. Butler's work be referred to ; where, in an observation on the well-known refusal to allow the pope a power of new-modelling the church of France, in conformity with the Concordât, with Buonaparte, he expresses himself as follows :

"The ecclesiastical division of France, by the Pope and Buonaparte, has not been acquiesced in by some of the Gallican prelates : they appear much perplexed between allegiance to the Bourbons and duty to the pope. In defence of their conduct, they invoke the canons of the church, which, in the strongest and most explicit terms, declare it unlawful to impose a new bishop to the see of any bishop who is alive and has not resigned, or been canonically deposed



from its see. Their appeal to the canons must be decided in their favour, if the case should be tried by the ordinary rules of the ecclesiastical polity of the Roman Catholic church. But, at the time we speak of, no sentence, founded on their rules, could be carried into execution. Such was the extraordinary state of things, that nothing short of the *dominium alterum*, or the right of providing for extraordinary cases by extraordinary acts of authority, could be exerted with effect: and that *dominium alterum*, in the spiritual concerns of the church, the venerable prelates cannot, consistently with their own principles, deny to the successors of St. Peter." — *A connected Series of the chief Revolutions in the Empire of Charlemagne, by Charles Butler, Esq.* (page 225.)

Farther documents, extracted from Dr. Milner's Pastoral Letters, and from other high Roman Catholic authorities, seem highly important; they are as follow:

"A dieu ne plaise, monsieur, qui j'entreprene ici l'apologie des seuls évêques

légitimes de France, (meaning the French Bishops who have not given up their sees).

Page 5.

“ Pie VII. par la formation de l'Eglise Concordataire, a, en effet, révoqué les brefs de son predecesseur et admis les principes fondamentaux de la constitution civile du clergé.” — *Defense du Clergé, &c. par l'Abbé Blanchard, Juin 27, 1808, page 23.*

Other strong assertions, in these and other works, being urged against Pius VII. Dr. Milner (Pastoral Letters, page 11) as Bishop of Castabala, says, “ Do not your ears, dear brethren, tingle with horror at hearing such impious as well as schismatical language from French priests? and would you not have supposed that I was repeating to you the infuriate invectives of Martin Luther against Leo X. ? Yet these men were once highly respectable before angels, as well as men, in quality of confessors of the faith.”

“ Nor can I persuade myself that the greater part of these victims of honour and loyalty, the emigrant nobility and gentry

of France, will agree to forfeit the glorious and consoling title of Catholic, from any party or human respect whatever."—*Ibid.* page 16.

"But this method of *appealing from the living speaking authority of the church* to their own false positions and pitiful sophisms, which Luther and all other heretics and schismatics necessarily have had recourse to, has been uniformly protested against by her illustrious fathers and doctors."—*Ibid.* page 18.

"The faith and unity of the Catholic church being a common concern, to attack it in any one member is to attack it in the whole body."—*Ibid.* page 24.

"I caution you not to permit l'Abbé P. L. Blanchard and the Abbé M. Gaschet to administer or receive any sacrament."—*Ibid.* page 26.

"The grand immortalizing principle of the Catholic church is that *living speaking tribunal* for deciding all controversies. This tribunal is the clear audible voice of her supreme head and her other chief pastors,



By this living authority all disputes among Catholics have ever been settled : whilst sectaries always appeal to a dead letter, whether of scripture or of ecclesiastical decisions, as interpreted by themselves.”—*Bishop of Castabala's Supplement*, page 7.

“ Une eglise aussi completement asservie ne peut être l'église de Jésus Christ, dont la liberté est inséparable. Cette vérité frappe les esprits. Nous l'avons entendue exposer, dans la chaire évangélique, avec autant de solidité que d'éloquence.”—*Extract from Abbé Blanchard's L'Etat Politique et Religieux de la France, &c. par l'Auteur de la Controverse Pacifique*, 1806, page 433.

Another work, conceived to be by the same author, intituled, “ Observations sur la Lettre de l'Inquisition, &c.” page 17, contains the following extract:—“ Il faut éclairer les pasteurs, tant sur erreurs que sur les dangers du concordât, pour éclairer par eux le peuple même. Mais il nous parait impossible de l'attaquer avec succès, tant qu'on en respecte l'auteur. Attaquer la transaction, et ménager celui d'où elle



émane, ce sont deux choses contradictoires dans le termes."

Some of the Roman Catholics, however, have asserted, that the authority claimed by the pope over the laity is only of a spiritual nature and that it can in no degree interfere with their duties of allegiance. It is well and ably stated, by that great man, Lord Clarendon, in his work, entitled "Animadversions upon St. Cressy's Imputation refuted and retorted, of fanaticism, fanatically imputed to the Catholic church," by Dr. Stillingfleet, at p. 244. See also, two following pages,—“They who insist on his (the pope's) having a spiritual power, as most of the moderate Catholics do, without imagining it can, in the least, lessen their affection and loyalty to the king, which they do really intend to preserve inviolable, must as clearly explain and define what they understand that spiritual power to be, which may otherwise be extended as far as the assertors of his temporal and spiritual power intend them to extend; nor, in truth, can they be secure of their own innocence, of which

they think themselves in possession, until they fully know, from those who entangle them with distinctions, what the spiritual power is, and what submission they are bound to pay to it, which, seeming to be some obligation upon their conscience, it is fit they may be sure it cannot involve them in actions contrary to their duties, which they can hardly be sure of, and less satisfy others, till they absolutely disclaim any power to be in him at all, with reference to England."

On this subjects we may refer to the language of Mr. Butler, (p. 225.) in considering the power of the pope to transfer allegiance ; from which it will appear, how truly the spiritual power includes the temporal.

An accurate observer of our nature, who has attended to the springs and motives of human actions, will soon discover that those persons, who, under the pretence of religious direction, have once gained an influence over the mind of man, have no difficulty in directing every feeling and action in the common concerns of life.

A striking instance of the discretionary judgement allowed to be exercised in the time of Queen Elizabeth is related by Holingshed, where Campion says, "She is my lawful queen, and I obey her;" but being asked, by some persons, supposing the pope commanded the contrary, replied — "They must not so deeply enter into his conscience."

But this influence is strengthened and confirmed, to almost an unlimited extent, by the important power of absolution, as professed and acknowledged by the Romanists, who consider it not merely as declaratory but judicial. Hence arises the most powerful and irresistible influence over the temporal concerns of their votaries.

When to this amazing power are added the consequences arising from spiritual interference in marriage, the lucrative traffic in indulgences, the accession of sacerdotal importance, arising from the necessity of extreme unction and masses for the dead, no hesitation can arise respecting the absolute and uncontrollable dominion such a



religion must possess, even in the common occurrences of life.

But, if we proceed still farther in our inquiry, if we examine the events which have happened within the compass of our own remembrance, we shall find, that, when a violent change in the government has taken place (as in France) that the Papal power, from political motives alone, has legalized such usurpation by crowning the usurper, and by new modelling the Gallican church according to the will and fancy of the reigning monarch: We shall also find that, in England, Roman Catholic bishops and priests have deprived of their functions other priests, who have complained \* of the injustice of such proceedings, and have retained their allegiance to the form of the antient church and government. Can it then be asserted, that the Roman claims of supremacy do not affect the allegiance of the

\* Vide Pastoral Letter of John, Bishop of Castabala, V. A. addressed to all the Catholic Clergy of the Midland District, p. 26.



subject? Or shall we be accused of bigotry and illiberality in concluding, from these facts, that, in case of any danger threatening the Protestant government, the principles of the Roman Catholics would naturally promote disaffection among their followers? And in this and every other instance it should be noticed, that it is the attachment to Rome and the supremacy\* of the church in all its decisions which is the original cause of the mischief. The danger arising, to gross minds, from absolution,† being considered judicial, must be very palpable; innumerable instances in the course of the Irish rebellion have occurred: it has been ascertained, that absolution was then extended to acts of rebellion even about to be committed!

A very strong argument, to prove the un-

\* Vide the Supplement to a Pastoral Letter of the Right Rev. John Bishop of Castabala, V. A. p. 8.

† “A Review of the Policy and peculiar Doctrines of the Modern Church of Rome.” By the Rev. P. Roberts. p. 56, 57. E. Williams, 11, Strand.

controulable power and influence of the Roman Catholic principles, arises from the late memorable conduct of Dr. Milner, respecting the Veto proposed to be allowed to the king on the appointment of Roman Catholic bishops. It will not be disputed that he authorised the Duke of Norfolk and Mr. Grattan to make the offer, on the part of the Roman Catholics, in each house of parliament; it is due to his character as a gentleman not to doubt it; he must also have been aware of the ready and thankful acquiescence, on the part of the Roman Catholics, in his proposals respecting the concessions to be made in their favour. No one of a candid mind can suppose, that a reverend person, present during the debates, could permit a statement to be made in his name to which he did not assent: of his fair intentions no doubt is meant to be entertained; with the subsequent proceedings we are acquainted, that the whole Roman Catholic body, in Ireland, at their grand meeting, on the 14th Sept.

1808,\* declared their unanimous refusal to make the sacrifice ; (a sacrifice not at all interfering with the pope's spiritual conveyance of ordination ;) and in such declaration Dr. M. offers no apology to the houses of parliament or to the British public, who were imposed upon by the offers, but contents himself with saying, that the proposal itself was nugatory, "and that he would shed the last drop of his blood rather than consent that the king should have any influence, direct or indirect, in the appointment of Roman Catholic bishops !"† after which he was again elected their agent to superintend their proceedings in England. Thus, therefore, the Roman Catholic agent in England makes a proposition which is thought to convey a security, and the question of granting farther privileges and concessions is debated on that view of the sub-

\* Vide Irish Magazine, Sept. 1809, pages 449 to 454. See also the late Declaration of the Irish Roman Catholic Clergy.

† "Tour in Ireland," 2d Edition, p. 309.



ject ; a declaration against the legality of such a proposition being drawn up by the authority of the mass of Roman Catholics, the agent declares, first, that the proposition which he offered was completely nugatory, —and next, that he would on no account allow the king to have any influence, direct or indirect, in the appointment of the bishops. Thus then the members of the Roman Catholic church at this present period will not allow the trifling security we require, in return for the privileges and power they so imperiously demand : the conclusion is surely obvious ; that, whatever concessions they may be inclined for a moment to propose, the constant and unabated influence of the Roman Catholic doctrines on their mind, —the powerful domination of these principles (to which they bear an attachment as unalterable as the principles themselves are professed to be) on their conduct, must threaten with certain destruction our establishment of church and state, if it is once deprived of its antient and approved safeguards, if



the barriers between itself and its implacable and unchangeable enemies are removed and dissolved.

Before the subject of the Veto is dismissed, it may not be improper to urge how very little real security it would afford to the crown; the intention of the proposal was to enable the crown to prevent the admission of disloyal persons to the episcopal bench: even if this point was gained, can it be contended, that the principles of the Roman Catholic religion, from which the danger, and, in some cases, the disloyalty, result, would not act with their genuine influence on the minds and conduct of the general mass of Roman Catholics? But what reliance can, in these times, be placed on the steady attachment of any Romish prelate or ecclesiastic to an heretical establishment, in opposition to the claims and doctrines of Rome? In truth, the rejection of the Veto, on the part of the Roman Catholics, evinces the arrogant pretensions and principles of that church; (especially when we consider that, as yet,

they are but petitioners) but, even if granted, we cannot reasonably suppose that it would afford a shadow of security.

In defence of the proposal to admit the Roman Catholics into parliament, and to places of political power and trust, the chief reason urged is grounded on their numbers: it is not here intended to make a statement of their real numbers, which could not, without direct authority, be satisfactory. It has, however, been asserted, in a very respectable quarter, that, according to the comparative population of England and Ireland, the numbers contained in a house in one of the best inhabited parts of Ireland, and the numbers of Protestants and Roman Catholics received at the Foundling-Hospital, the Roman Catholic population cannot be any thing near four millions, nor indeed so high as two-thirds of the Irish population. Those, indeed, who apprehend danger from extending favours towards them, as tending to increase their political consequence, draw from their numbers an argument against granting fur-

ther favours ; but the utmost force which can be allowed to the opposite mode of argument is this, that the numbers (which on every side are admitted to be very considerable) entitle any petition on their behalf to strict attention ; the ultimate question will be, how the public good can be best promoted ? Their claims from numbers alone may be met by the distinct declaration of their advocate, Mr. Pitt, "That he allowed no claim whatever as to right ; and that it was only from expediency, and for conciliation, that the measure could be a moment justified in his opinion." Mr. Pitt adds, " he (Mr. Fox) seems to consider that there is only a shade of difference between the expediency and the right ; whereas my view of the difference is fundamental : I consider right as independent of circumstances. With regard to the admission of the Catholics to franchises, to the elective franchise, or to any of those posts and offices which have been alluded to, I view all these points as distinctions to be given, not for the sake of the person who is to pos-



sess them, but for the sake of the public, for whose benefit they were created, and for whose advantage they are to be exercised.”\* And it must be allowed, that, if their numbers gave them a claim of right to be admitted to power, they would also entitle them to a provision for their ministers; but, if numbers give this double claim, it would be hard indeed that other sects, if harmless in their tenets, should not also have a provision; but to allow this would at once put an end to any notion of an established church, the exclusive provision for which (except in some slight particulars elsewhere alluded to) is considered by every person as essential to an establishment: a double establishment is impracticable, and numbers alone can never afford any well-founded claim to admissibility into places of trust and power; the fitness of the grant must entirely depend on the benefit to be thereby produced to the community at large,

\* Vide Rivington's Ann. Reg. 1801, p. 134, 135; and Cobbett's Parliamentary Debates, 1805, p. 1014.



and the security or advantage to be derived to the state.

In considering the claims of the Roman Catholics in Ireland to extension of privileges, we ought not to overlook those of the Protestants, in that country, to the security of what they already possess; they are, I think, on many accounts entitled to the gratitude and attention of their Protestant brethren in Great Britain; it may be desirable to state a few instances, which tend to shew, that they are the very part of the Irish population most subject to a state of persecution: the removal from office of Mr. Giffard,\* for exercising his right of petitioning against the Roman Catholic claims; the quashing, by the late ministry, a bill to enforce residence on the part of the clergy of Ireland, although, in England, one had just passed for that very purpose, and such a bill was a hundred-fold more requisite in Ireland; the superiority of weight which their greater numbers must necessarily give

\* See the case of his son Musg. Vol. I. p. 304.

the Roman Catholics, to a certain extent ; and the discountenance shewn on all late occasions to any zeal for the Protestant cause ; must convince all who are in heart attached to that cause, that, unless it be better supported, much less if it be farther weakened, Ireland must soon be subjected to all the horrors of a renewed popish predominancy. To admit the prospect of such horrors is dreadful ; and, if the humane mind recurs to the histories of similar revolutions, it must shrink back with dismay, and sooner submit to any national calamity than withdraw that protection from the loyal protestants of Ireland which their fidelity has so well deserved, and which it is our interest as well as our duty, on every principle of justice, gratitude, and sympathy, to extend to them, and now most peculiarly, when, confiding in the protection of the united parliament, the Protestants of Ireland have submitted their fate so much into the hands of others. A few instances are subjoined in the Appendix, proving how little effect can be hoped from conci-

liation, and tending to shew the discouragement given even to the most distinguished loyalty of the Protestants.\*

The last subject intended to be considered was, the good likely to arise from granting farther concessions to the Roman Catholics.

On the hazard to which the church-establishment may thus be subjected; the complete toleration which the Roman Catholics now enjoy; and the violation of the principles of the Revolution, and, indeed, of every fundamental principle of the British constitution, which farther concessions to the Roman Catholics would involve; observations have already been offered.

It remains to be considered, what probability there is of satisfying the Roman Catholic body, by granting what they ask:

Secondly. Whether the priests are likely to be contented: and,

Lastly. What prospect there is that Ireland would be freed from discontent, and the real situation to which the Protestants

\* See Appendix, p. 83.



there, ever the firmest friends to the union with Great Britain, will be reduced?

What the Roman Catholics now ask is free admission to parliament, and to all places of power and trust.

To the highest orders the possession of such objects must be gratifying; but to the lower orders, what satisfaction will result from such privileges being obtained by the superiors of their persuasion, unless they derive some advantages from it themselves; and what alteration in their condition is it that they require? They have now the full power of acquiring property of all descriptions, except in corporations; they have full enjoyment of personal liberty and liberty of conscience; they have obtained the elective franchise, in common with Protestants: but these, we are told, are not the things they wish for: the possession of power by their superiors will alone content them; is there the man living, it may be confidently asked, who can believe the assertion? The last great rebellion was subsequent to the period of their perfect enjoyment of civil and reli-



gious liberty, and it surely cannot be uncandid to look to their declarations and conduct at that time, and what it is they do not possess, by way of ascertaining their real objects.

They have not an establishment for their clergy, and are compelled to pay tithes to a Protestant establishment; and, being subject to a Protestant government, are, by that government, excluded from certain stations of power and profit, because such exclusion has been thought necessary to its stability. Now to suppose that men will struggle most earnestly to rid themselves of such restrictions, privations, and burthens, as they have most sensibly felt is not very unfair or unnatural; but, if the whole of their proceedings show, that, whatever pretensions are made to the contrary, such has, in truth, been their object the presumption, as to what they now or may hereafter wish to attain, stands on a much stronger foundation. What were the real grievances complained of at the rebellion but the Protestant ascendancy? What were the objects

they sought but deliverance from tithes, from all payments to the Protestant church, and from the connexion with Great Britain? Who were their principal instigators, and had the actual command over them, granting and denying protections at their pleasure, but their bishops and priests? In what part of the whole rebellion does it appear, that admission to parliament, and to the few excepted offices, civil and military, were the main grounds of complaint? Let any man read Sir R. Musgrave's faithful and vainly-assailed history, and he will see, that it was against all Protestants that the rebellion was directed, that Ireland might become a complete Roman Catholic nation; that the pope might be supreme in state, as well as peculiarly supreme in church. To cite instances would be endless; the truth of what is here asserted will be found in the frequent refusals of Roman Catholics to obey their priests, when attempting to restrain their violence against Protestants in power; it is to be found in their excessive zeal to destroy all Protestants, by which

they lost the assistance of those in the north, who were disposed to assist them on democratical principles ; it is to be found in their removing Bagenal Hervey from his command, though zealously disposed to assist them in pulling down establishments, but not to erect the pope's tyranny on their ruins, nor to murder all the Protestants in Ireland. A few references on the subject are subjoined in the Appendix, proving these assertions beyond the possibility of doubt.\*

On the examination of Emmett and other rebels, it was confessed that " Catholic emancipation was a mere stalking-horse ; and that disunion with Great Britain, and Roman Catholic supremacy, were the real objects of the rebels." Let the consequences of all the concessions hitherto made, and the subsequent immediate demand of more, and, in some instances, of the very things, which, in the last preceding application, they had declared a determination not to demand, be recollected ; and there cannot

\* See Appendix, p. 74, &c.



be a man who will conceive that what is now required could produce permanent content. But, if the Roman Catholic laity could be satisfied, would the priests be so? This is a question still more important than the other, for the whole history of the Irish rebellion proves that they were the instigators, that they were the life, of it: and yet we are to be seriously told, that the granting to the Irish Roman Catholics the terms of their petition would satisfy them, and prevent future rebellion: and that, though the priests were the principal actors in the rebellion, yet they sought for nothing for themselves: or, at least, if the mass of Roman Catholic population had these things granted to them, which they could derive no real benefits from, and had not the others, (viz. a Roman Catholic establishment, and freedom from all the claims of Protestant clergy,) they would not be disposed to rebel again, nor yield to the views of their priests. This, by the way, is in direct opposition to the declaration of the traitor Emmett, as above referred to; to all probable reasoning



*a priori* ; to all the facts in the history of the rebellion, and to common sense. To believe it, would be to forget the influence which the Romish priests have over their flocks, and all the essential and distinguishing principles and tenets of the Roman Catholic persuasion.

In considering the present subject, I must repeat, that we should never overlook the Protestants in Ireland ; nor forget who these Protestants are, and what their conduct has been. The Protestants have been introduced there for the express purpose of guarding the interests of Great Britain, for the sake of securing the union between the countries ; they have zealously, faithfully, and most laudably, fulfilled their trust ; and now their interest is not to be considered ; they are to be regarded as oppressors of the Roman Catholics, for being true to the cause which they were bound to defend, and in which they have been most pitiable sufferers. Will *they* be well satisfied ? A minority it is allowed they are, numerically ; but in property, in education, in character, by far

the most important part of the Irish nation. Union at home and national security should be the grand objects of the legislature, and now, forsooth, the way to obtain it is, by disgusting all that part of the Irish nation, which is most attached to Great Britain ; that part which is decidedly adverse to France ; and by increasing the strength of that party which has always had an attachment to France, and, from its religious persuasion, can never be attached to our church-establishment. If then it be true, as must appear to every unbiassed mind, that there is no probability of the Roman Catholic body being satisfied, by the grant of the concessions now demanded, still less of such grant producing general union in Ireland, among Protestants as well as Papists, is not the legislature of the united kingdom imperiously called upon to consider, again and again, what the sacrifice really is which they are now called upon to make, and whether it is not of the constitution itself, both in Great Britain and Ireland ?

Having thus endeavoured, however in-

adequately, to discuss the different points proposed for our consideration, it now remains for me to draw my conclusion from the whole, namely, that I feel most strongly convinced, that the church-establishment in Ireland would be dissolved and destroyed for ever, and that the church-establishment in England would be materially endangered should the favours, now so imperiously demanded by the Roman Catholics, be granted. I am persuaded also, that the limits of toleration have been extended to the utmost bounds which public security will permit; and that, under the specious and misapplied name of liberality, privileges have already been granted to the Irish Roman Catholics which have materially tended to endanger the constitution of that country; I allude to the elective franchise which, however I may disapprove of the measure, I still hold, as part of the union, sacred and inviolable. It will appear also, from a reference to the several acts of parliament respecting the revolution, the union with Scotland, and the title and succession

of the House of Brunswick to the throne, that the intention and spirit, as well as the letter, of all these several acts, whether taken separately, or considered as one legislative whole, forbid any farther concession ; and that the coronation oath, whether interpreted literally, or with reference to the history of the times in which it was settled, and to its subsequent alterations at the union with Scotland, and to the principles of all the acts of parliament existing when it was thus framed, requires, conscientiously and constitutionally, an unalterable determination in the crown to resist any farther concession ; and that the constitutional principle on which the right to the throne is founded would be abandoned by granting the present claims of the Roman Catholic petitioners. I am also convinced, by referring to the principles acknowledged in every age, both past and present, that the doctrines and tenets of the Roman Catholic church are emphatically *semper eadem*, at all times dangerous to a Protestant establishment, particularly if those professing



them are to be admitted to stations of influence and power in the legislature or government, which is clearly exemplified in the late Irish rebellion. I am also justified in concluding, that no hopes can reasonably be entertained that the minds of the Irish Roman Catholics can be satisfied with anything short of the entire possession of the church-establishment in Ireland ; nor do I conceive that even that possession would entirely satisfy them.

I must also profess it to be my decided opinion, that the Protestants of Ireland have the first claim to favour and protection, that all the best interest of the nation, every religious, civil, and social obligation require that the Protestant cause should be fostered and encouraged ; and that, if the large and important privileges, already extended to the Roman Catholics, will not preserve their loyalty to the king and constitution, it would be most impolitic to grant them any more power, as even their advocates must allow that any farther concession would only produce farther demand, and that it

would in no wise tend to produce quiet and content ; but, on the contrary, that it would aggravate the evil.

It has been already asserted, that the account of the comparative numbers of the Protestants and Roman Catholics in Ireland has been incorrectly stated ; but, even allowing the statement to be true, I can by no means infer from thence the expediency of farther concession : on the contrary, as the danger arising from popish principles, is increased, the securities against their final predominancy should be proportionably strengthened and enlarged. I must, therefore, give it as my decided opinion, that the maintenance of the constitution, in church and state, that the union of England with Ireland, and (what is most important of all, in my mind,) that the permanence of religion itself, and all the bonds of union in public and private life, will be most deeply injured, should any farther concessions be granted to the Irish Roman Catholics. I hope and trust, that the general feeling of the public in Great Britain, and of those

who maintain the most sincere attachment to the English interest in Ireland, will, on the present application, or any future one that may be presented to parliament on the subject, be announced in the forcible and determined declaration,——“*Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari.*”





## APPENDIX.

[Musgrave, Appendix, p. 555.]

*Extract from a Romish Priest's Letter, Aug. 30, 1799.*

“On the return of the king's government, my first concern was to obtain his majesty's pardon, for that degree of rebellion of which I was guilty,—which I obtained without any difficulty; but guess my astonishment at receiving a letter from my bishop, silencing me from my clerical functions in this diocese, while his own conduct was what chiefly led me astray, (if I except the degree of terror the rebels put me into after the government was upset all round me), for, during the ferment which preceded the explosion, he never instructed me how to act. Instead of excommunicating them for their horrid rebellion, he gave them his benediction in the chapel-yard, the day they took \* \* \*, two days before they called on me to follow them. *Instead of excommunicating the barbarous murderers at \* \* \*, he gave all his priests power to give absolution for murder; a power which he ever till then usurped to himself.*”

[Musgrave, vol. 2, p. 46.]

Bagenal Harvey, the rebel general, said, on his trial, "That he became a member of the Irish union three years before; that he imagined the only object was to reform the constitution; but that he did not till recently discover that the popish priests were deeply concerned in it, and that the *extermination of the protestants* was their main design. That having opposed their sanguinary views, he was deposed, and the command given to that infamous villain, father Roche."

[Musg. vol. 2, Appendix xix.]

*Authentic Account of James Bragham's Confession.*

"The day but one before his execution, two popish priests went to visit him, and, upon their entering his cell, he exclaimed, "Begone from me, you accursed! who have been the cause of my eternal damnation; *were it not for you, I never would have been guilty of murder!*"

"Now gentlemen, remember what I tell you: if you and the Protestants are ever in the power of the Catholics again, as they are now in yours, they will not leave one of you alive; you will all go smack-smooth; even those who campaigned with them, if things had gone well with them, would in the end have been killed. I have heard them say so many times."

"Just as the executioner was about to turn him off, he called out, "Stop; Capt. Boyd, you have taken down my confession perfectly correct; if it were not for the priests, I never would have been guilty of murder."

[Musg. App. 25, p. 530.]

“ An Irish Roman Catholic bishop tells us, that he was absolutely ignorant of the massacre at Wexford being intended or perpetrated, until some hours after it had ceased. Here he is convicted of an untruth by the strongest moral evidence. The town of Wexford is so narrow, that, if a boxing-match or a riot happened in any part of the main street, every one of the inhabitants could not but hear the noise occasioned by it. The populace began to shout at eleven o'clock, soon after the black flag was erected on the quay : the slaughter at the gaol began at two o'clock and continued on the bridge till late in the evening ; at the immolation of every victim the popish multitude rent the air with acclamations. Could their bishop and his priest alone remain deaf ?”

[Musgrave, Appendix 25, p. i. 532.]

*Affidavit by John Higginbottom.*

“ He was a prisoner with the rebels in Goree, the day of the battle of Arklow ;—was in a room at a public house ;—shortly after, Kavenagh and Synnot, priests, came in to them ; after some time, Synnot said, ‘ Murphy had but seven men when he began the business, and now you see what it has come to.’ He then took out a letter, and shewed it to Redmond, saying, ‘ You may read that, and see how long I have been concerned in this business ; and, though I stood against it as long as I could, you see, in that letter, how I was compelled by the bishop to it.’”

[Musg. Vol. p. 396 to 402.]

*Instances of Perjury in obtaining Protections and taking Oaths of Allegiance.*

“ But the solemnity and sacredness of oaths, and the earnestness of protestations, banished all suspicion on the part of government, magistrates, and the loyal subjects, though the subversion of the former, and the extermination of the latter, had been some months concerted.”

[Page 443.]

“ The camp at Vinegar Hill was constantly attended by from ten to twenty priests, who daily said mass at the head of each rebel column, and afterwards pronounced an exhortation to animate them in the extirpation of heresy, and in the exclusive establishment of their own, the only true orthodox faith.”

[Page 399.]

“ At Enniscorthy, the two Mr. Poundens sat for an entire week, previous to Whitsunday, giving protections to the public, in consequence of their having taken the oaths and surrendered their arms: these proceedings took place in the presence of three priests, who, to give a greater appearance of sanctity to them, insisted that they should be sworn on a popish manual, yet some of these protections were found in the pockets of rebels who were killed on the Monday following, when they attacked Enniscorthy.”



[Page 455.]

“ Patrick Conners, being converted to protestantism, was denounced by his parish-priest, who laid his flock under an interdict not to deal with him, which reduced him to poverty, from having got a livelihood as a shopkeeper at Enniscorthy.”

[Musg. vol. ii. p. 285, Appendix xi.]

“ A man was tied up when his skin was tender from the preceeding day's whipping, when he acknowledged his guilt, and “ that the parish was organized, and armed with pikes.” Soon after he was taken down ; which convinced the conspirators he had confessed : they then became emulous in making confessions, and surrendering arms ; and, in the space of a few hours, seventeen hundred pikes were surrendered ; and Father Kennedy, the *parish-priest*, voluntarily acknowledged he had been sworn by Father Meara, a priest, who had sworn many others, though he had been previously examined by Mr. Otway, and swore he was perfectly ignorant of the conspiracy. He and Father O'Brien were sentenced to be transported.”

[Musg. vol. 2, p. 283. Appendix xi.]

“ By an information moved in the crown-office, dated 11th April, 1798, Phineas Hunt swears,—“ That he was impelled, by a system of terror, to be sworn and join the society of United Irishmen, in Feb. 1798, having been

assured that the French would join them, and that all not of their party would be murdered; but, in swearing him, the oath contained an obligation to murder all Protestants."

N. B. On the oath being presented to him, he started and said, 'Am I to murder my father, and mother, and all my family?' On which the rebel officers seemed much confused, and said it was not the right oath."

[Musg. vol. ii. Appendix i. p. 210.]

*Instance of the Effects of Roman Catholic Principles in 1768.*

Examination of Mathias O'Brien, priest.

" Informant saith, that his reason for knowing the said schemes and designs to be true is, that the said Dr. Butler did solemnly bind him to the following oath :—" To be true and faithful to the church of Rome, and to promote its good, and to be faithful to him, his archbishop." That after signing the said promise, in a book belonging to the said Butler, he was told by him, that these risings of the white-boys were set on foot solely for the advancement of the Roman Catholic faith, and the extirpation of heresy in this kingdom ; *and that as there was but one God, there should be but one religion.*"

[Musg. vol. i. p. 175.]

" A respectable Protestant clergyman in Roscommon, having his house broke open in the night by pikemen,

they offered to swear him to be loyal; on assuring them he was loyal to the king, they said—"What king?"—He said—"King George."—They cried,—“No no, a Roman king!”—adding they “Must have a king of their own.”

[Musg. Vol. I. p. 94.]

*Claims of Roman Catholics, Feb. 4, 1792.*

At a committee, “that they asked only,

1st, admission to the profession and practice of the law.

2d, capacity to serve on county magistracies.

3d, a right to be summoned and serve on grand and petit juries.\*

4th, a right of voting in counties only for protestant members of parliament, in such a manner that no Roman Catholic freeholder should vote, except he either rents or cultivates a farm of 20*l.* per annum, in addition to his 40*s.* freehold; or that he shall be in possession of a freehold of 20*l.* a year.”

[Musg. Vol. II. p. 393. App. xx. 1.]

*Affidavit of Andrew Sheppard, 7th Sept. 1798.*

“On the morning of the day the rebels marched from the camp of Gorey to attack Arklow, one Murphy, a

\* “Here be it observed, that there never has been the slightest ground for complaining of the laws having been partially administered by protestant judges.”

priest, who was killed at Arklow that day, mounted on a car and preached a sermon, assuring them they were fighting in the cause of God; that the more of the heathens (meaning the king's army) they would kill the sooner they would go to heaven; that if any of them died in battle they would be sure of immediate salvation;\* he pulled bullets out of his pockets, and assured them they had hit his limbs but could do him no harm."

He added, "they put protestants to death," often saying, "that the kingdom was their own, and that there should be but one religion."

[Musg. Vol. II. p. 381. App. xix. 12.]

Robert Whitney swears, "That if any one of them was killed he went directly to heaven, as they were fighting the battle of Christ; on the contrary, that any heretic, like him, went to hell immediately; that it was prophesied, many years ago, that there would be but one religion, and that would be theirs, the popish."

[Musg. Vol. II. p. 456.]

*Catechism of United Irishmen.*

"I believe in a revolution founded on the rights of man, in the natural and imprescriptable right of all the Irish citizens to all the land."

\* See also page 408, where there is an oath found on many of the rebels who were killed at New Ross and Ballicarew, swearing to destroy all heretics.



[Page 457.]

“ As an Irishman, what do you hope for ?”

“ The emancipation of my country and equality of rights, a fair division of the land, an abolition of religious establishments, and a representative government.”

[Page 458.]

“ What benefit, in a general sense, would emancipation be ?”

“ Ireland delivered from England would give us immense resources,” &c. “ Other branches of trade would unfold themselves to independent Ireland now impossible to enumerate.”

[Page 460.]

“ How would you alter the property in land ?”

“ By dividing the antient estates among the descendants of those Irish families who were pillaged by English invaders.”

“ What is your view by wishing to abolish religious establishments ?”

“ To eradicate every species of jealousy and distrust, to ease the nation of a useless and weighty body of hypocrites and cheats.”

[Musg. App. viii. p. 236.]

*Society of United Irishmen of Dublin, Dec. 30, 1791.*

“ A more unjust and absurd constitution cannot be de-

vised, than that which condemns the natives of a country to perpetual servitude, under the arbitrary dominion of strangers and slaves."

[App. xi. p. 258.]

*Extracts from Informations sworn before Sir R. Musgrave,  
Dec. 3, 1797.*

"That the United Irishmen deprived him of his arms the 10th November last; that they had resolved to murder many gentlemen in the country: and that he heard some of them say, that a Roman Catholic would ensure salvation by killing three protestants."

[Page 266.]

*Conspiracy in the City of Cork.*

"They often produced black lists of the principal protestant families in the kingdom, who, under the denomination of heretics, were to be assassinated, and the Beresford family and Mr. Ogle were among them? and it was often asserted, that a person would ensure salvation by killing a certain number of protestants."

[App. vi. p. 230, 1.]

*At a Meeting of the Society of United Irishmen of Dublin,  
Nov. 9, 1791, James Napper Tandy, Secretary.*

Resolved,—3dly, "that no reform is practicable, effi-

cacious, or just, which shall not include Irishmen of all religious persuasions.”

*Oath annexed to the above.*

“ I, A. B. in the presence of God, do pledge myself to my country, that I will use all my abilities and influence in the attainment of an impartial and adequate representation of the Irish nation in parliament; and as a means of absolute and immediate necessity, in the establishment of this chief good of Ireland, I will endeavour, as much as lies in my ability, to forward a brotherhood of affection, an identity of interest, a communion of rights, a union of power, *among Irishmen of all religious persuasions*, with which every reform must be inadequate, &c.”

[Musg. App. xxiii. p. 504.]

*Bandon.*

1695.—“ The house of commons, in their address to the viceroy, pray ‘to have the town restored to its former state, that it might be a refuge and protection to the English against the cruelty of the Irish.’”

[Page 505.]

“ The Irish directory hoped and intended to have made Bandon another Belfast, by engaging the inhabitants in their cause; but the loyalty of the protestants rendered them impregnable against the arts of seduction.

“ A few towns like Bandon would materially tend to strengthen the English interest in Ireland, by encouraging the growth of protestanism.”

After these extracts I wish to insert an instance (from what cause I profess myself completely ignorant) strongly tending to repress all this zealous loyalty which the best interests of the empire so imperiously demand; it is as follows, extracted from an Irish paper:

[Cork, July 15, 1809.]

“An extraordinary occurrence has recently sown the seeds of public dissension in the loyal protestant town of Bandon, in this county, the effects of which may prove of the most serious consequence. On the 1st of July, the yeomanry corps of that town and neighbourhood, consisting of 600 men, assembled on their parade with orange lilies in their hats, in commemoration of the battle of the Boyne, in conformity to established usage. These trophies were objected to, and they were desired to be removed: this, however, was not complied with at first, till a more peremptory order was given, with an intimation, that obedience to command was the principal duty of a soldier; the orange lilies were in consequence struck; but the next day the corps assembled, and, after deliberating on all their proceedings, almost unanimously resolved to file their arms, and the corps, it seems, deem themselves virtually dissolved.

“Till within this few years almost every inhabitant was protestant.”

[Musg. App. p. 523.]

*Instance of Conciliation on the part of Protestants, and contrary Disposition of Roman Catholics.*

“Some time since, Lord Granard ordered the band of



his regiment to play during divine service in the church of Athy, where they were quartered; but the popish musicians refused to obey, having said that a priest had assured them they would be damned if they entered a protestant church. On inquiry it was discovered, that a priest, who was a member of the popish seminary at Carlow, gave them this charitable assurance; and, on being questioned on it, the priest avowed that it was consonant to the established doctrines of his church. In the same manner Doctor Coppinger, titular Bishop of Cloyne, would not suffer such of the band of the King's County regiment as were papists to play in the protestant church at Youghall, though, with the permission of the colonel, both the protestant and popish musicians had constantly played in the popish chapel."

It is also stated, "that the Romanists will not assist in a charitable collection at a protestant place of worship, though the protestants do at their popish chapels."

*Doctor Troy's Pastoral Instruction.*

[Page 73.]

"Catholics, therefore, are obliged to adhere implicitly to such decrees and canons, assembled in general council and confirmed by the pope, as to rules of faith; they are also obliged, in like manner, to submit to similar decisions and decrees of the pope, when expressly or tacitly assented to, or not dissented from by the majority of bishops."

[Page 76.]

“General councils are not absolutely necessary.”——  
 “As from various circumstances these assemblies are difficult, they on such occasions apply to their supreme head, or primate, the bishop of Rome, whose decrees on doctrinal points of faith and morals are respected by all Catholics, whether they consider him as infallible or not: the acquiescence of the majority of bishops in these decrees of the apostolic see renders them completely decisive and infallible.”

[Page 78.]

“Catholics, however divided on the question of papal infallibility, are unanimous in asserting the doctrine of exclusive salvation, in the *one true faith* and church.”

*Dr. Hussey's Pastoral Charge.*

[Page 3.]

“Remonstrate with any parent who will be so criminal as to expose his offspring to those places of education where his religious faith or morals are likely to be perverted. If he will not attend to your remonstrances, refuse him the participation of Christ's body; if he still continue obstinate, denounce him to the church, in order that he be considered a heathen and a publican.”

“Teach the Catholic military that the military garb they wear implies a manly candour that abhors such duplicity. That this manly candour is peculiarly the

character of an Irish soldier, who ought not to be ashamed of openly professing the Catholic religion,—the religion of Irishmen. Instruct them that, in all matters regarding the service of the King, their officers are competent to command them, and they are bound to obey ; but, in matters regarding the service of the King of Kings, their officers have no authority over them.”

---

That the sentiments and spirit of the present Roman Catholics are as intolerant as those of any former age, a stronger proof cannot be exhibited than in the following important extract from a Pamphlet, published since these sheets were sent to the press, entitled, “ An Elucidation of the Veto,” by the Rev. J. Milner, D.D. F.A.S. Page 48. “ Catholicity is not a religion of late date, nor of confined extent: it is the religion of your Apostles, the missionaries who converted and civilized you, of the framers of your constitution, and of the founders of your families, good and loyal men, I trust ; and however assaulted and oppressed, in every quarter, at the present day, it is still the religion, one and the same, of the great body of Christians throughout the world. The pretext then of benefiting any one portion of it by di-



viding it from its heads, or from its other members, is preposterous in the extreme; it is robbing them of the kernel and giving them the shell. Be assured that it is for those pastors exclusively to judge of its faith and discipline with whom Christ has deposited his divine authority, agreeably to the decision of the late Dublin Synod. All the claims of others, whether Catholics or not Catholics, to judge, and still more to act in these matters, however high, powerful, and numerous, they may be, are vain and schismatical. **THEY MAY AS WELL PRETEND TO PLUCK A BEAM FROM THE SUN AS TO TOUCH A FIBRE OF ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION.**"

To which, the following document, in proof that these claims are founded on the highest public authority and sanction, among the present Roman Catholics, is subjoined from the same Pamphlet, Page 60.

"In addition to the sixteen resolutions contained in their address to the Catholics of Ireland, the **PRELATES** in Synod assembled, on the said 26th of February, passed the following 17th resolution, respecting their agent in England, which they transmitted to him, in order to its being published there, in such manner as he should deem expedient.

**RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY,** That the thanks of this meeting be, and are hereby, given to the Right Rev. Dr. Milner; Bishop of Castabala, for



the faithful discharge of his duty, as agent to the Roman Catholic Bishops of this part of the united kingdom, and more particularly for his late Apostolical firmness, in dissenting from and opposing a vague, indefinite, declaration or resolution, pledging Roman Catholics to an eventual acquiescence in arrangements, possibly prejudicial to the integrity and safety of our church discipline.

Signed by order,

**P. RYAN, Bishop of Germanicia, Secretary."**

## POSTSCRIPT.

---

*Some few fresh arguments having been used on this most important subject, and other important documents having been obtained, especially the very curious book\* published for the use of the candidates for holy orders at Maynooth College, I have thought it right to add the following observations on this momentous question.*

---

THE political importance of our Established Church in Ireland is worthy serious consideration. That the prevalence of different forms and sects of religion is a serious evil, no one can deny ; and there are many circumstances in the state of Ireland, especially adverting to the characteristics of the Romish religion, which make differences in religion from the English Church there, peculiarly unfortunate. Let it, then, be considered, how the Established Church could be best promoted, and

\* Vide Tractatus de Ecclesiâ in usum Theologiæ Candidatorum in R. C. Coll. Maynooth.

how the national interest and strength, thereby, could be most effectually secured. It should be remembered, that the strength of Roman Catholic persons of rank must depend on their influence on the Roman Catholic population. To keep up the distinction of such population, and to increase its weight, must naturally, therefore, be their interests and their views ; but the extent of the Roman Catholic population (unless, by being established in Church and with the State, it could be identified with the national interests and feelings, all of which is, indeed, impossible) must necessarily cause weakness and apprehension : conflicting religious parties cannot fail to do so.

Hitherto, from a consciousness of the benefits enjoyed under the Irish Established Church, all other descriptions of Protestants have, in point of feeling and interest, generally speaking, been identified with it, in attachment to the Constitution. No one would wish to make them look to the Roman Catholics for favours and privileges, in preference to the Established Church ; but if the Protestant cause has now such difficulty even to maintain itself in Ireland, how lamentably precarious its state must be, if the favor, which, till within these few years, from having been extended to it, was promoting its rapid growth, was to be poured upon the Roman Catholic Church ; and such must necessarily be the result of giving them political rank and weight. No union is ever so strong as



that which is cemented by religious union ; and it may be here again repeated, that, as the interests of Irish Protestants are promoted by their connection with Great Britain, so must their attachment to that connection be their ruling passion and most anxious wish. No country in the world but Britain can have any influence on their feelings, or benefit their interests ; their hearts must be British ; such they have ever been regarded,—such they have ever been found,—as such they have ever been treated. It is, then, surely madness not to cultivate that interest to the utmost ; and not to cherish the Church and to endeavour, by all due means, to spread its influence and increase the number of its adherents, is surely the most short-sighted of policy.

In applying these arguments to Protestantism, it is also to be insisted on, that its cause and its principles are just ; that, by due encouragement of the means for conversion, it may hope to bring over the deluded followers of a corrupted, and, it is to be feared, an idolatrous, religion. Every convert, in that case, would be an addition of two to the strength of the empire ; but, if the Roman Catholics are to be courted, it cannot be that government can encourage any such exertions : if the chief object is to gain them, any thing tending to displease them will be discouraged, under the pretence of reviving religious animosities ; which,



in this age of liberality, are to be avoided, by abstaining from being earnest for the truth.

Religious principles are now thought to have little influence on the mind: they are admitted indeed into books, professedly religious, but as motives for action and guides of life in this enlightened age they are little regarded: they are not however therefore of less radical importance. It is stated, by the advocates for the Roman Catholic claims, that we have nothing to do with religious persuasions; that every one being answerable to God for acting according to his conscience, it is in the highest degree intolerant to interfere with any on such account. The assertion in the abstract, and in theory, is not to be denied; but it should be remembered that matters of conscience may become hurtful to society; in such case they are even criminal. The Gospel may be quoted to prove a community of goods; the inference is but natural that, in certain cases what would otherwise be called theft, is not an offence, but a virtue; and so of the Roman Catholic tenets: if, indeed, being only religious, they ended in mere effects on the individuals professing such tenets, and throughout their own religious persuasion merely, they might be of little importance to the state; such would be confessed to be, as merely religious tenets, the doctrines of transubstantiation, confession, absolution, indulgences, taking the Sacrament in one kind only, and any other peculiar doctrines of the

Papists, even including the spiritual power of the Pope. But can the infallibility of their Church, as asserted in their manual of instructions for their Candidates for Holy Orders at Maynooth College, be so considered, founded as it is in so many important points, tending to secure feelings and practices so dangerous to any community, professing other religious principles? It is there stated, distinctly, that the true Church must be infallible to be a true Church; that it must be unalterable in doctrine because infallible; that no existing Church but the Church of Rome has such characteristic; that it is necessary to be in the true Church to obtain salvation, and that there is no more possibility of any one being saved out of the true Church, (which is the Church of Rome, and that alone) than there was for any one to be saved, at the time of the great flood, who was not in the Ark of Noah.

It is also stated, that councils regularly convened, and where decrees are made, are everlastingly binding; and that indeed results from the assertion of infallibility and unchangeableness before alluded to: such councils are those considered to be, which contain all the most hateful doctrines the Church of Rome ever maintained. Is the principle to be maintained, and will any man say the conclusion is not to follow? Is it necessary in any argument for proving the conclusion from any premises, to prove that he who asserts the premises allows of the conclusion? Would it however be

sufficient, in considering what would be the conclusion drawn by any corporate body, to prove what every individual would allow to be such legitimate conclusion? Is the legitimate acknowledged book of instructions, or the assertions of individuals the better authority? Besides we have something very like proof. What was the conduct of Dr. Milner in regard to the Veto, but a deference of his own individual opinion and declaration to the authorities of the Irish Church? On principle, I consider that he was quite correct; but assuredly it affords a strong conviction of the mighty influence of the authority of the Roman Catholic Church! Nor should we ever forget the Popish doctrine of Bellarmine, "that different conduct is necessary" "when the Church is not the strongest." As, happily for the Protestant world, such has been the case of late years, it is only in conformity with such directions that the highest doctrines of Popery have not been insisted on: very high ones, however, have been quoted from Mr. Butler, Mr. Plowden, Dr. Troy, and others. But it must be obvious to every one that, in proportion as favours have been extended, higher doctrines, as well as higher claims, have been avowed; and concessions have been claimed, without such conditions as were before thought essential, and because the principles of the religion prevent allowing the conditions, although the concessions were before contemplated, from conceiving the religion was more conforming



in its disposition ; that is to say, as the principles are more irreconcilable with the religion of the state, fewer guards are necessary. To those who consider expediency to be every thing, and principles, as causes of action, nothing, such may be a sound conclusion ; but it is to be hoped, that general alarm will be felt at such inducements being held out by those who, God be praised, as yet, are but petitioners.

Another dilemma is asserted ; which is, the absurdity of denying their claims because you cannot trust them, when your only security is an oath. But those who so argue forget what the oath is, or what is its express purpose. The oath is to abjure the tenets of popery : that they cannot do. The consequent object is to exclude them from power because they are papists: they could not take it, and afterwards, while enjoying the profits of their perjury, return to the exercise of popery, to say nothing of the disgrace in society to which they must necessarily be subjected by such perjury.

It is said, we may have securities that the Roman Catholics shall not attack the Established Church. No binding securities can be given ; nor can those, who conceive that any power on earth can absolve a sovereign from his coronation oath, very consistently maintain that oaths can be securities against Parliament acting according to its will. No oath can be devised which can bind ; for the oath may be repealed first, and then the measure



carried. It is absurd to bind with oaths, those who are responsible only to themselves; and no oath can apply except to illegal conduct.

It will be useful, however, to consider what doctrines they are which prevail in the Romish Church; and here again, let it not be understood that the abstract doctrines are the circumstances which make the Papists dangerous, but the motives which induce them to admit such doctrines. Those, be it again recollected, are the authority and infallibility of the Church. In their manual of instruction it is laid down, that the Scriptures (and what can be proved from them) do *not* contain all doctrines necessary to salvation; and that assertion is supported by producing other doctrines, strangely mixed up together, which the infallible Church declares to be necessary, and therefore they must be true; such for instance as transubstantiation, the receiving the sacrament in one kind, (the latter of which is insisted on very much, to prove the authority and infallibility of the holy Church), and various other doctrines, the object in alluding to which is to point out the extreme authority a Church must exercise over its members, when it requires them to admit, on its authority, doctrines so contrary to, not incomprehensible by, common sense. The principles on which they are to be believed being established, namely the authority and infallibility of the Church, the absolute subjection of the minds of

its faithful votaries must be self-evident; and, if any are disposed to conceive that, in serious Roman Catholics, the withdrawing of the sacrament and of absolution must not produce wonderful effects, it is to be feared it can proceed only from the want of religious principles. The very absurdities which are required to be believed and done, are the strongest possible proofs of the hold which the Church has on their minds. It is easy to attempt to explain away or deny all the mischievous doctrines; but unchangeableness, as a characteristic of its truth, infallibility as another, and universality, which are asserted to belong to it alone of all churches in the world, are over-ruling principles, to which decrees of councils, matters of faith and of practice, belong as mere corollaries: and that the effects of them are practically in existence, the late rebellion bears undeniable testimony; those who doubt that should well examine the whole of Sir R. Musgrave's History, especially his Appendix of authorities.

It is not meant, however, to charge the principles, which are stated to be inherent in the Roman Catholic religion, on all its members; and no one, looking forward, could have ventured to charge on a King and Queen of France, or even on a Duke of Guise, &c. the horrors of the dreadful Massacre of St. Bartholomew.\* Persecution, however, has

\* Vide "An Awful Warning," just published by Stockdale, Pall-Mall.

always been a characteristic of that religion where it had the power. Evidence, on oath, from men about to appear before their Creator, and without hopes of mercy from such confession, is recorded by Sir R. Musgrave, as existing in documents in Ireland ; that the destruction of Heretics was meritorious ; that absolution was given prospectively by Bishops and Priests to those who died in rebellion in supporting the cause of the Church. The question is not, what men of rank and education may feel, or how they would act, but what the priests and rude population would do : and, judging them from the latest experience, and deducing their principles from their own book of instructions at the College (paid by the public in a great measure), surely cannot be hard usage.—If such priests and population are to be conciliated by favours shewn to others rather than to themselves, the effect is most unnatural ; and their own testimony, given in the rebellion, is preferable to the authority or theory of any others, and that authority proves distinctly the reverse. Among the practices of the Romish Church, which stand on its own authority, should not be omitted the invocation of the Virgin Mary especially ; and though the act of adoration to her, or any of them, is disclaimed, still the practice of Ave-Marias, which is repeated perhaps more frequently, even than prayers to our Blessed Saviour, as appears by the Irish Roman Catholic prayer-book, extended to Ireland



by Pope Pius VI. in 1778, must lead the ignorant population to attribute ubiquity, omnipresence and intercessional powers to her. To a Protestant such conduct cannot but appear idolatrous ; and the alteration of the Commandments, and the following explanation of what they call the ninth, make evident enough their own self-conviction on the subject ! It is as follows :—"Ninth Commandment. Inward concupiscence of the flesh, that passes no further than the mind ; as willingly taking pleasure in thinking of those things which are forbidden to be done by the sixth Commandment." It is to the authoritative disjunction, and interpretation, of the Commandment, that the observations are meant to apply ; for it is well known that the first thing forbidden in it, is not coveting the wife, but the house of one's neighbour. Nor is idolatry by name even mentioned, in their explanation, as prohibited. With respect to the worship of Saints, the following extracts are offered for consideration.

Page 9. " I commend my soul, and all that I am, to the intercession of the glorious Virgin Mary, my good Mother and advocate, to St. Joseph, and my guardian angel, and to all the Saints in Heaven, whom I most humbly beseech to assist me at the hour of my death."

Page 244. " The Rosary of the Blessed Virgin, the first mystery—the meditation. Let us contemplate in this mystery, how the Angel Gabriel



saluted our Blessed Lady with the full title of Grace, and declared unto her the incarnation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Then say, Our Father *once* ; Hail Mary, *ten times*."

Page 251. "Hear, O merciful God, the prayers of thy servants, that we who meet together in the society of the most holy Rosary of the blessed Virgin Mother of God, by her intercession, may, by Thee, be delivered from the dangers that continually hang over us."

Page 262. The fifth Mystery. The Meditation—"Let us contemplate in this Mystery, how the glorious Virgin Mary was, with great jubilee and exultation of the whole Court of Heaven, and particular glory of all the Saints, crowned by her Son, with the brightest diadem of glory." The Prayer—"O, glorious Queen of all the heavenly citizens, we beseech thee, accept this Rosary, which (as a crown of roses) we offer at thy feet ; and grant, most gracious Lady, that by thy intercession, our souls may be inflamed with so ardent a desire of seeing thee so gloriously crowned, that it may never die in us, until it shall be changed into the happy fruition of thy blessed sight."

Page 261. The prayer—"O, most prudent Virgin, who entering into the heavenly palace, didst fill the holy angels with joy, and man with hope, vouchsafe to intercede for us in the hour of our death, that being free from the illusions and temptations of the Devil, we may joyfully

and securely pass out of this temporal state to enjoy the happiness of eternal life."

It is not meant to be asserted, that any instance establishes the fact of the Virgin Mary being declared to be exalted, in the minds of the Papists, to the Divinity, but that the imposition of such prayers, by authority of the Church, united with the other authoritative injunctions, *viz.* receiving the Sacrament in one kind (merely because the Church wills it so, not denying that it could, equally, if it chose, give it in both kinds); the doctrine of transubstantiation, for denying which our blessed Reformers were put to death; the doctrine of the perpetual virginity of the Virgin Mary; the acknowledgment of the truth of all which is demanded, and made to constitute proofs of the necessity of the Church's authority and infallibility, because they cannot, some of them, be proved from Scripture. These, and many other doctrines, prove from their absurdity, the strictness of submission to Church rule and authority, which that religion requires,—and how, even the absurdities, and may it not be said, practically, the idolatrous practices of that Church, rivet the chains upon its adherents. Let it then be considered, whether any conscientious Protestant ought to do what may tend to increase its influence and profession. The case applies to the consciences of all Protestants. Will they wish to make it more prevalent throughout Ireland? For the extension of

favours, it must be universally acknowledged, must tend to that effect. I would ask men of religious principle, if they think a country deserves the blessings and protection of God's Providence, which is indifferent on such a subject. That question I wish all conscientious Protestants to consider; and I would add, that I am not unwilling to state my conviction, and ground it on the proceedings of the rebellion of 1798, that the Roman Catholic religion would I will not say again cause a persecution in Ireland like that of St. Bartholomew, but I fear would subject the Protestants to severe persecution: for in the principles there are and can be no change; *the sameness is the foundation stone of that Church.*

The grand motive to induce acquiescence in their claims, is general conciliation and tranquillity to the empire. The effect in Great-Britain should be well estimated and ascertained, and, whether the consciences of Protestants will be satisfied with their having done their duty by quietly suffering Ireland to become a Roman Catholic country. To talk of tranquillizing the Roman Catholics of Ireland, without going that length, is absurd in the highest degree, seeing, as they do, a different sect from the Church of England established in Scotland: and, (should the claims of admission to Parliament and all high offices be conceded) having it acknowledged that there is no danger in their religious tenets, it cannot be that the population,



of Ireland will be satisfied that they alone shall not obtain their desires. It is impossible to deny, but the establishment of their Church must be admitted to obtain the object of tranquillity, if that point is to be obtained by concessions : but it may be more than doubted if it were to be so obtained, if they would not then require that the Monarch should be allowed to be Roman Catholic ; and would they, could they, fail to favour such an one as was so ? The sanctity of the Coronation Oath is violated, by being made to depend on the construction, not of the taker of it, but of the Houses of Parliament ; and, with a Sovereign popishly inclined, which then might be, though now it cannot, without perjury and sacrilege on his part, and a Parliament growing daily more indifferent to the Established Church, as must be expected, it is not very prophetic to say, the Church must soon fall : for if now that we all call ourselves Protestants, we make these concessions to them for tranquillity, what shall we next do for the same object, after increasing their power ?

The question to England then is of the highest possible importance : and to Ireland it cannot be less so. The danger to the Church is the solid, the only objection ; the only object is general conciliation. A principle of the Union is the maintenance of the United Church of England and Ireland in both countries. No one can suppose that a double establishment in Ireland can be lastingly satisfactory. No one can say that the



principles of the Union, or the Coronation Oath, can be maintained by allowing the Roman Catholic Church to be established in the room of the Church now established : the arguments, therefore, for the desirableness of a Roman Catholic Church there, *instead* of the present Church, are inadmissible ; but if two establishments could not be satisfactory to the Roman Catholic population, any more than to the Protestants, and if the establishment of the Roman Catholic religion alone cannot be, what hopes can be entertained of satisfying Ireland by further concessions ; even of satisfying the Roman Catholics of Ireland ? for to concede all these points, even to Roman Catholic Establishments, must be most grating to the Protestants ; if indeed every concession must not be so, except to those of strong political feelings and attachments.

It cannot be said but the same means of discontent and violence will remain which ever have existed ; that the same priests will remain to stir up the same population ; that the same motives of seeking popularity among the Irish population, by which any are now prompted, from electioneering or other purposes, which now exist, will continue ; and with respect to the Roman Catholic Establishment, much stronger motives, even the highest possible sense of duty, must actuate the Roman Catholic representatives. No securities can be given to prevent their endeavours to obtain such a boon from Parliament ; and the Coronation Oath may

be construed to bend to the plenary dispensing power of Parliament: a fit precedent to its acknowledging that of the Pope himself. But the most important object of all, as it relates to Ireland, is the effect which any system will be likely to produce permanently; and it should seem that the best mode of determining the point would be by examining it under different suppositions.

In case it should be determined to keep things as they are, it will not be said that discontents are likely to be expressed in Great Britain; and it will not be maintained, however any motives of policy or interest of a local description, may prompt Protestants in Ireland to favor the claims of the Roman Catholics, that they can feel greatly dissatisfied by peculiar favor being shewn to themselves. To the Roman Catholics in Ireland then, and the general effect which withholding further concessions from them would produce in themselves is to be enquired; and here it is necessary to remark that, if refusing to make more concessions will produce discontent, the same result will follow from refusing it so far as they may require. But whatever discontents may occur, there is no advocate for concessions who maintains that the will of the Irish Roman Catholics is to fix the extent of them; and consequently, unless the mass of the population is to be satisfied by the extent of concessions made, any which are made will only increase the power of a discontented Roman Catholic population. It is impossible

any one can believe, that granting the claims now preferred, can satisfy the Irish population: the delusion must very soon be evident to them, and their strength of numbers having been made the means of producing advantages to others of their religion, must make them strive to obtain some for themselves. The next step must be some privileges for their priests in point of stipend; and, in this case, supposing any legal provision is made, while nothing is withdrawn from the present Established Church in Ireland, it will hardly be contended that the Roman Catholic population will feel much indebted for an increase of general taxation. Nor is it easy to conceive the mode in which it can be arranged: some controul over those to whom it is afforded must be necessary, but it is not to be expected that it will be granted, especially as any controul, by a Non-Catholic King, has been, on alleged principles, refused. Here again the observation naturally occurs, that as some were willing to grant favors on expectation of reciprocal security, so now, on finding the principles of the Roman Catholic religion to exclude all hopes of it, the favor should be shewn, in a greater degree, because the principles are found still more irreconcilable: the wisdom appears no stronger than the logic of such mode of reasoning. But will any one hope that the establishment of two religions in Ireland can promote peace? That rivalry must continue as strong as ever, cannot be doubted, till one



has a decided ascendancy. That, in all elections and all struggles for preference, the mass of Roman Catholics will act as a body no one can doubt; and it cannot be denied that every favor must increase their strength, and must afford an additional argument to their claims to have still further concessions made them.

It is in vain, therefore, to expect that tranquillity can result from such a state of things; history, common sense, and the declarations of the rebels themselves, in 1798, contradict the supposition. But then would even the establishment of their own religion, in room of the church now established, content them? Are they not known to call themselves the Irish Nation, to consider as gross injustice their ancestors having been deprived of their property for acting in support of their religious principles? and when Parliament shall declare that there is no danger from such principles, will not a preponderating population require the restitution of property, for the alienation of which no state necessity any longer exists? It may be easy to attempt to say that changes cannot now be admitted in the state of property; but will not their interests, accompanied by their increased power, make them look anxiously to obtain so substantial an object?

The argument from the expectation, at the Union, on the part of the Protestants and Roman Catholics, and from Mr. Pitt's declarations, I come again to allude to.

With respect to the latter, first : having personally heard his statement in the House of Commons, that, before the Union, no reference could be made, with justice, to his authority as to any thing like a pledge, or otherwise than from his having argued hypothetically of the greater ease and safety with which the claims might be argued, refused, or granted in an United Parliament, it is most unwarrantable to ground any claim on that footing. Whatever hopes he might hold out in quitting office, they cannot be stated as pledges on the Union, for that event had occurred before ; and his patriotic conduct in again assuming the office of minister, though his wishes no doubt remained the same, proved how his conduct was, and would be, guided by considerations of practicability and conciliation. And moreover it should be recollected, that it was as a measure of general conciliation, that Mr. Pitt supported it ; and, unless it is generally acceptable to the population of Great Britain, it cannot be that. If a notice is ever given stating a resolution of Parliament to consider the fitness of granting indulgencies, at a distant day, that opinion will appear. Hitherto, especially under the patriot high-principled minister, whose destruction it has pleased Providence to permit, the nation has felt safe that no such event would occur. But it should be remembered, that Mr. Pitt likewise considered the principles of the Roman Catholics to be such, as to admit of sufficient securities for the safety of the

Church. That he conceived he could prepare due securities, and that they would admit them, no one can doubt : but the only ones which have ever been suggested, they have disclaimed and refused ; not in such manner as to allow of any substitution if any equally effective, but on principle, as incompatible with the principles of their religion ; if therefore the principles of their religion are so much higher than he apprehends, his authority in that view, also, cannot be quoted. But further, no one can say, notorious as the fact is of the royal determination of the Sovereign, from a conscientious construction of this oath, that Mr. Pitt would have thought it fit or decent to demand of a Regent, acting in behalf of the Sovereign, to act contrary to his conscience ; a conscientious feeling which was known to actuate the royal mind so long since as 1793, when Earl Fitzwilliam was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. To Mr. Pitt's authority it is therefore most unjustifiable to appeal, his latter conduct, without insinuating the least change in his opinions, forbids such appeal.

The expectations of the Irish Protestants must be next considered ; and here let it suffice to state shortly, that it was evidently the sentiment, in Great Britain, that the Irish Protestant Parliament could not grant the claims of the Roman Catholics ; and notorious that they always most decidedly rejected them : it is not therefore to be said that they, the Parliament which voted the Union, did so in



hopes of the United Parliament admitting the claims of the Roman Catholics. That the Roman Catholics might hope for such effect may be true; and that, on other views, they might have more violently opposed it, is not improbable: but it was the Irish Parliament of Protestants which determined the question; and, if they did not do it with that view, and if there was nothing like pledge to the Roman Catholics, the expectations of the Roman Catholics can be of no great weight. Besides, it should not be overlooked that it was felt that the claims of the Roman Catholics could not be conceded, because, giving power to them might separate them from British connection; does it not then follow that it must still materially weaken it? It is in the comforts of the lower orders, and the principles of the higher and wealthier and more powerful, that the bond of attachment to government subsists; such would best result from the encouragement, as heretofore, of the Protestant interest, and maintenance of the Protestant ascendancy.

A new argument is now advanced when securities are required — *shew us our dangers*: our ancestors knew them, and had felt them; many suffered in defence of our religion; the laws distinctly state the dangers by the provisions they contain. But who is there that can doubt, even on the arguments of the warmest advocates for the Roman Catholics, that extreme danger would

exist : the argument for concession is, conciliation on account of the numbers of the Irish Roman Catholics, and the dangers to be apprehended if they are not gratified in their wishes. No one, who denies the fitness of establishing their religion, will suppose that a Roman Catholic representation would object to vote for such object ; nor can any one deny, that the most extreme discontent would be created in the minds of that population, on finding, that their almost unanimous representatives could not obtain for them, what, they must consider as of all things the greatest boon they could obtain : it would be the first duty of such representatives, and an act of high benevolence on their principles, to endeavour to obtain such object ; and who can deny that their possessing such increased means to obtain that object, would not be a serious danger to the Church, and one against which no securities but exclusion can guard ?

In addition to the evils and dangers arising from Romish principles, those which result from a foreign sovereign influence are universally confessed : it being foreign is doubtless a great evil, but the mischief, even of the foreign supremacy, arises from the nature of the influence, namely the spiritual power which is possessed over the minds, and in the very controuling manner in which the principles of the Romish Church uphold that spiritual power. But, on reflection, it is to be feared it will be found, not that this supremacy is not and

must not be very dangerous to any state, for the history of the world and common sense put that past all doubt; but, that if an Irish, a national supremacy should be established, the danger would still continue: the influence is from the religious principle, and if the Pope now, being a foreigner, has the spiritual power over their minds which is so dangerous, will not a national Pope have equal power? Will not the Irish be equally attached to him? will they be less willing to obey his will, and to support his authority? In any question relating to Roman Catholic interests, extension of privileges or power, (and let it not be supposed in matters unlawful, but in combined endeavours legal, and even, more than conscientious, in matters of clear religious duty on their own principles,) will not this national Pope feel as strongly as any of them? will not his strength as Pope, his power as Pope, depend on his Irish adherents? And, supposing any measures of the Irish people, so instigated and supported by him, were to be thought dangerous and fit to be suppressed, where is the man who can say that any steps could be taken against him without producing a Popish rebellion?

To endeavour to escape from present difficulties without considering whether a system of expediency may not produce much greater, cannot be considered as acting like statesmen; and, if the motives are in truth, conciliation, and unanimity, and felt to be so essential on account of the num-



bers and strength of the Irish Roman Catholics, it is surely most unwise to add to their strength, and consequently to their numbers; for increasing favour will assuredly tend to do so, without good ground for thinking that the object will be attained: and in objecting to confer any favours which must tend to perpetuate the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland, I feel that I am advocating the cause which would most materially benefit that description of my fellow subjects; convinced as I have ever felt, that, from their subjection to the ignorance and tyranny of the spiritual thralldom to which they are thereby exposed, their grievances principally arise.

On the whole the result appears to be this: that, from referring to all the latest authorities and practices of the Irish Roman Catholics, there is no change in principles, nor, when occasions call them forth, of the practical effect of such principles on them whose case is before us, namely the Irish Roman Catholic population; that it is in vain to hope to satisfy them, without granting a great deal more than any one has yet contended ought to be granted to them; (it is not meant to be insinuated that more will not be proposed if any more is granted now, for the downhill road of concessions is most easy, it requires only, as it were, to submit to the mechanical laws of gravitation, and to sail with the stream); that it is merely for the sake of conciliating them and securing their zealous attach-

ment to the national cause, that concession can be at all justified ; if therefore there are no well-founded hopes of giving permanent content and producing permanent unanimity, it is only a weak procrastination of the evil day when a stand must be made, to a time when, by concessions having been profusely granted, it will be far more difficult to resist their demands ; for the assistance of the loyal British hearted Protestant will be weakened in proportion as favours are extended to the Roman Catholics, by which they will be strengthened. It will follow then, that, in this view, no further concession should be made. It appears also, that the real controlling authority proceeds from the principles which they profess ; and that, although the existence of danger from a foreign supremacy is acknowledged to be necessarily great, yet substituting a local or national one, could not remove it ; that the evils therefore of divided feelings and divided views are unavoidable ; and that, whatever securities might be proposed, all except exclusion would be found unavailing, as each step conceded must lead to the demand of another being taken ; for the principles contained in that religion must ever make those who profess them seek to advance its interests to the utmost, and against legal exertions no securities can provide ; but every addition of the strength of power to that of numbers, which is given to the Irish Roman Catholics, must prompt them to seek for their full wishes. It appears also, that

the very evil of division must be promoted by concession, for, to secure and continue his full influence, it will be rendered the decided interest and policy of the leaders of the Roman Catholics to keep up the distinction and peculiarities of their religion,—that, to those who will reflect, it must surely appear clear, that it is only by temperately supporting that description, whose attachment is decidedly fixed by every feeling, interest, and principle to the British connection, and by doing every thing practicable to promote the internal peace and prosperity of Ireland, that we can hope to weather the storms we are encompassed with, and wait God's time for enlightening the minds of those, whose darkened judgments make them still retain a religion, from the principles of which the discord necessarily proceeds.

*May, 1812.*



## CAPITAL PUBLICATIONS ON THE ROMISH CLAIMS.

*Printed for STOCKDALE, Jun. 41, Pall Mall.*

AN AWFUL WARNING, or the MASSACRE of St. BARTHOLOMEW, Inscribed to the Memory of the Rt. Hon. Spencer Perceval; with two fine plates of the Murder of Admiral Coligny, and the Duke of Angoulême insulting the Corpse. Price 3s. 6d.

A LETTER to the EARL OF FINGAL, on the Claims of the Roman Catholics. By Lord GRENVILLE, Chancellor of Oxford University, price only six-pence; fine paper, 1s.

THE HISTORY of the INQUISITIONS; including the secret Transactions of those horrid Tribunals, to the present Time. With prefatory Remarks on the Catholic Question generally, and on Lord Grenville's Letter in particular. In 1 large Vol. 4to, with 12 beautiful plates, price 2l. 12s. 6d. A few copies on royal paper, hot-pressed, with proof impressions, price 4l. 4s.

*For the Character of this Work, see the Quarterly Review, No. XII. Anti-Jacobin Review, August 1810, and British Critic, March 1811.*

THE HISTORY of the PARISIAN MASSACRE, wherein all the minute Circumstances of that sanguinary Event are faithfully portrayed. By the Rev. THOMAS COMBER, A. B. 1 vol. 8vo. price, on royal paper, hot-pressed, with proof plates, 1l. 1s.

THE NATURE and EXTENT of the DEMANDS of the IRISH ROMANISTS. By the Right Hon. P. DUIGENAN, M. P. 1 vol. 8vo. Second Edition, price 6s.

STRICTURES on the MOTIONS respecting the Pledge which His Majesty demanded from his late Ministers, and which was made a subject of Accusation; in a Letter to Lord Viscount Howick. By JOHN BOWLES, Esq. price 2s.

A SPEECH which ought to be spoken on the Claims of the Roman Catholics. With supplementary notes, on the Idolatry of the Romish Church, &c. price 3s.

MEMOIRS of the KING'S SUPREMACY, and of the Rise, Progress, and Results of the Supremacy of the Pope, so far as relates to Civil Affairs. By the Rev. T. B. CLARKE, LL. D. Domestic Chaplain and Secretary to the PRINCE REGENT. 1 large vol. 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION, and the only Means by which it can be effected, pointed out. Second Edition, much enlarged, price 3s.

A CONCISE HISTORY of the RISE, PROGRESS, and EFFECTS of the PAPAL SUPREMACY, with Observations on the Alterations made in it by BUONAPARTE, price 4s.

SPEECH of LORD VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH, in the House of Commons, 25th May 1810, on the Roman Catholic Question. With an Appendix of official Documents, price 2s.

This speech is of the first importance, as it contains an authentic disclosure of all those circumstances which compose what has been termed MR. PITT'S PLEDGE TO THE ROMAN CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

SPEECH OF LORD BORINGDON, in the House of Lords, June 5, 1810, on the Catholic Question, Second Edition, 1s. 6d.

PROCEEDINGS of the GENERAL COMMITTEE of the ROMAN CATHOLICS of IRELAND, in 1792 and 1798, compared with those of 1810 and 1811; comprising sketches of characters, price 2s. 6d.

HINTS to all CLASSES on the STATE of the COUNTRY, at this momentous Crisis. By One of the People. Second Edition enlarged, price 1s. 6d.

A LETTER to the PRINCE REGENT, on the ultimate Tendency of the Roman Catholic Claims. By the Author of "A Vindication of the Reign of George III." Price 2s. 6d.

The three last Pamphlets are particularly important from present circumstances; by the latter, it appears that the Roman Catholics do not exclude from their demands even the THRONE ITSELF.

A COMMENTARY on the PROCEEDINGS of the CATHOLICS of IRELAND, during the Reign of his present Majesty George the Third.

A REFUTATION of the Statement of the PENAL LAWS which aggrieve the CATHOLICS of IRELAND. Price 3s.

---

*For a list of Publications on general topics see the annexed Catalogue.*